

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-241
H. R. 8240

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 8240	1
Digest of Public Law 85-241	2

Index and summary of H. R. 8240

May 1, 1957	Sens. Russell and Saltonstall introduced S. 1940 which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.
May 2, 1957	Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 7130 which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.
June 19, 1957	Rep. Vinson introduced H. R. 8240 which was referred to Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as introduced.
June 26, 1957	House committee reported H. R. 8240 with amendment. H. Rept. No. 638. Print of bill and report.
July 2, 1957	Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 8240. H. Res. 309, H. Rept. 680. Print of resolution and report.
July 8, 1957	House began and concluded general debate on H. R. 8240.
July 10, 1957	House passed H. R. 8240 with amendment.
July 11, 1957	H. R. 8240 was referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Print of bill as referred.
Aug. 8, 1957	Senate committee reported H. R. 8240 with amendment. S. Rept. 842. Print of bill and report.
Aug. 12, 1957	Senate passed H. R. 8240 as reported. Print of bill.
Aug. 13, 1957	House conferees were appointed on H. R. 8240.
Aug. 14, 1957	Senate conferees were appointed on H. R. 8240.
Aug. 16, 1957	Conferees agreed to file report.
Aug. 19, 1957	House received conference report. H. Report No. 1193. Print of report. Senate agreed to conference report.
Aug. 20, 1957	House agreed to conference report.
Aug. 30, 1957	Approved: Public Law 85-241.

1. Summary of the data	1991	1	1991
2. Summary of the data	1992	2	1992
3. Summary of the data	1993	3	1993
4. Summary of the data	1994	4	1994
5. Summary of the data	1995	5	1995
6. Summary of the data	1996	6	1996
7. Summary of the data	1997	7	1997
8. Summary of the data	1998	8	1998
9. Summary of the data	1999	9	1999
10. Summary of the data	2000	10	2000
11. Summary of the data	2001	11	2001
12. Summary of the data	2002	12	2002
13. Summary of the data	2003	13	2003
14. Summary of the data	2004	14	2004
15. Summary of the data	2005	15	2005
16. Summary of the data	2006	16	2006
17. Summary of the data	2007	17	2007
18. Summary of the data	2008	18	2008
19. Summary of the data	2009	19	2009
20. Summary of the data	2010	20	2010

Digest of Public Law 85-241

USE OF PUBLIC LAW 480 FUNDS FOR FOREIGN MILITARY HOUSING.
Authorizes certain construction at military installations.
Continues the authority of the Secretary of Defense, subject to approval of the Director of the Budget Bureau, to use foreign currencies of a value not to exceed \$250 million acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation for military family housing in foreign countries.

S. 1940

MAY 1, 1957

A BILL

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
\$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,-
000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,-
000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
\$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,-
530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:

Land acquisition, \$40,000.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,

and utilities, \$110,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,

and land acquisition, \$95,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-

000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-

search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training

facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-

000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,

\$1,169,000.

Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational

facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
14 utilities, \$6,866,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$7,549,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Troop housing and utilities, \$3,022,000.

1 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

2 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance
3 facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

4 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing,
5 \$4,663,000.

6 (Sixth Army Area)

7 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, mainte-
8 nance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility,
9 and utilities, \$1,487,000.

10 Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance
11 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,066,000.

12 (Military Academy)

13 United States Military Academy, New York: Utilities,
14 \$1,666,000.

15 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

16 Various installations: Operational facility, community
17 facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

18 (Tactical Installations)

19 Various locations: Family housing, \$1,736,000.

20 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

21 Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance fa-
22 cilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community
23 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general: Family housing, \$658,000.

Eielson Air Force Base: Administrative facility,
\$248,000.

Fort Greely: Maintenance facility, \$891,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Family housing, \$1,878,000.

Fort Richardson: Operational facilities, maintenance facility, family housing, and utilities, \$6,447,000.

Tactical installations: Family housing, \$4,910,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities,
\$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and
utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing,

1 community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facili-
2 ties, and utilities, \$10,000,000.

3 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or
4 develop classified military installations and facilities by ac-
5 quiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing
6 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
7 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
8 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

9 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or
10 develop research and development installations and facilities
11 by proceeding with construction made necessary by new and
12 unforeseen research and development requirements, if the
13 Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such con-
14 struction for inclusion in the next military construction au-
15 thorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national
16 security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct,
17 convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary
18 public works, including land acquisition, site preparation,
19 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount
20 of \$5,000,000. The Secretary of the Army, or his designee,
21 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Sen-
22 ate and House of Representatives immediately upon reach-
23 ing a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction

1 of any public work undertaken under this section, including
 2 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

3 SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
 4 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
 5 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
 6 military tactical installations for assignment as public
 7 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
 8 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
 9 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
 10 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
 11 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
 12 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
 13 structed with appropriated funds.

14 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
 15 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
 16 STATES" in section 101, as follows: under the subheading
 17 "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps),"
 18 with respect to Red River Arsenal, Texas, strike out
 19 "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,212,000".

20 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
 21 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
 22 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and

1 inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,-
2 000", respectively.

3 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
4 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
5 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

6 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
7 TIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Department of the
8 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
9 land, strike out "\$2,360,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$3,137,000".

11 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Military Academy)" with respect to United States Military
13 Academy, New York, strike out "\$9,950,000" and insert
14 in place thereof "\$11,983,000".

15 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
16 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
17 tion 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000"
18 and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,-
19 870,000", respectively.

20 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
21 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
22 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

23 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
24 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out “\$1,736,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,039,000”.

(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof “\$212,000”.

Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out “\$8,589,000” and insert in place thereof “\$9,874,000”.

Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)”—

(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$452,000” and insert in place thereof “\$525,000”.

(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out “\$1,129,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,491,000”.

Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)”—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out “\$1,055,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,240,000”.

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike

1 out “\$6,597,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,-
2 072,000”.

3 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES (Med-
4 ical Corps)”—

5 (1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
6 Texas, strike out “\$549,000” and insert in place thereof
7 “\$876,000”.

8 (2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash-
9 ington, strike out “\$333,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$669,000”.

11 (3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
12 Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$3,557,000”
13 and insert in place thereof “\$4,472,000”.

14 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sec-
15 ond Army Area)”—with respect to Fort Holabird, Mary-
16 land, strike out “\$612,000” and insert in place thereof
17 “\$800,000”.

18 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
19 (Fourth Army Area)”—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
20 strike out “\$12,922,000” and insert in place thereof
21 “\$14,283,000”.

22 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
23 (Fifth Army Area)”—

1 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
2 out “\$7,487,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,621,-
3 000”.

4 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
5 strike out “\$8,615,000” and insert in place thereof
6 “\$9,893,000”.

7 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
8 out “\$145,000” and insert in place thereof “\$193,000”.

9 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
10 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)”—with respect
11 to various installations, strike out “\$3,014,000” and insert
12 in place thereof “\$3,204,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
14 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
15 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101 as follows:

16 Under the subheading “Alaskan Area”—with respect to
17 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out “\$469,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$559,000”.

19 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
21 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and
22 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$234,820,-
23 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$543,887,000”, respectively.

1 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress
2 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
3 STATES" in section 101 as follows:

4 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
5 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

6 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
7 York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$136,000".

9 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
10 strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$8,593,000".

12 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
13 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—

14 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
15 out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000".

16 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
17 Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place
18 thereof "\$1,847,000".

19 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
20 (Fourth Army Area)"—

21 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
22 "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000".

23 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
24 "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

25 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,

1 strike out “\$1,092,000” and insert in place thereof
2 “\$1,373,000”.

3 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, “\$200,-
5 783,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$203,331,000”.

6 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
8 tion 402 the amounts “\$86,916,000”, “\$200,783,000”, and
9 “\$323,462,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$95,010,-
10 000”, “\$203,331,000”, and “\$334,104,000”, respectively.

11 TITLE II

12 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
13 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
14 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
15 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
16 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
17 projects:

18 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

19 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

20 Naval engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Mary-
21 land: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

22 Naval shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock,
23 \$25,438,000.

24 Naval shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
25 \$1,452,000.

1 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland:
2 Utilities, \$115,000.

3 Naval shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
4 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$4,660,000.

5 Naval submarine base, New London, Connecticut:
6 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

7 Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,998,000.

8 Naval shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
9 facilities, \$391,000.

10 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

11 Naval station, Key West, Florida: Housing, \$1,326,000.

12 Naval station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
13 facilities, \$544,000.

14 Naval station, Newport, Rhode Island: Housing, com-
15 munity facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

16 Naval base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
17 \$7,808,000.

18 AVIATION FACILITIES

19 (Naval Air Training Stations)

20 Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Opera-
21 tional facilities, \$566,000.

22 Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational
23 facilities, \$140,000.

24 Naval air station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

1 Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-
2 tional facilities, \$160,000.

3 Navy auxiliary air station, Meridian, Mississippi:
4 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,-
5 067,000.

6 Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, Louisiana:
7 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

8 Naval air station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facili-
9 ties, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

10 Navy auxiliary air station, Saufley Field, Florida:
11 Operational facilities, \$39,000.

12 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

13 Naval air station, Alameda, California: Operational
14 facilities, \$185,000.

15 Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

17 Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
18 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
19 \$7,751,000.

20 Naval air station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational
21 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.

22 Naval auxiliary landing field, Crows Landing, Califor-
23 nia: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

1 Naval auxiliary air station, Edenton, North Carolina:
2 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

3 Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, California: Opera-
4 tional facilities, housing, and land acquisition, \$4,774,000.

5 Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational
6 facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

7 Naval seaplane facility, Hertford, North Carolina: Oper-
8 ational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities, hous-
9 ing, and utilities, \$8,051,000.

10 Naval air station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
11 facilities, \$39,000.

12 Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Operational fa-
13 cilities, \$130,000.

14 Naval air station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
15 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

16 Naval auxiliary air station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
17 tional facilities, \$384,000.

18 Naval air station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
19 cilities, \$3,401,000.

20 Naval air station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
21 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

22 Naval air station, North Island, San Diego, California:
23 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

24 Naval air station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and

1 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
2 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

3 Naval air station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
4 tional facilities, \$882,000.

5 Naval auxiliary landing field, San Clemente Island,
6 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
7 utilities, \$9,448,000.

8 Naval air facility, South San Diego Bay, California:
9 Waterfront facilities, \$6,795,000.

10 Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Opera-
11 tional facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,433,000.

12 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

13 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South
14 Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
15 istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

16 Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
17 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
18 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
19 improvements, \$6,503,000.

20 Marine Corps air station, El Toro, California: Opera-
21 tional facilities, \$3,736,000.

22 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, California:
23 Operational facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$7,-
24 080,000.

1 Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina:
2 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

3 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

4 Naval air development center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania:
5 Operational facilities, \$39,000.

6 Naval air station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-
7 tional facilities, \$2,209,000.

8 Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, California:
9 Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San
10 Nicolas Island) and land acquisition, \$7,669,000.

11 SUPPLY FACILITIES

12 Electronics supply office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Admin-
13 istrative facilities, \$92,000.

14 Naval ordnance supply office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsyl-
15 vania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

16 Aviation supply office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ad-
17 ministrative facilities, \$550,000.

18 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

19 Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Georgia: Com-
20 munity facilities, \$140,000.

21 Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, California: Main-
22 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
23 and utilities, \$8,001,000.

24 Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina:

1 Operational and training facilities, medical facilities, troop
2 housing, and utilities, \$5,147,000.

3 Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
4 lina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facili-
5 ties, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

6 Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
7 tional facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

8 Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community
9 facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
10 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

11 Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California:
12 Training facilities, \$116,000.

13 Marine Corps training center, Twenty-Nine Palms,
14 California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-
15 istrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

16 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

17 Naval ammunition depot, Bangor, Washington: Utili-
18 ties, \$316,000.

19 Naval ordnance test station, China Lake, California:
20 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

21 Naval ordnance laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
22 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

23 Ordnance aerophysics laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
24 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

1 Applied physics laboratory, Howard County, Maryland:

2 Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

3 Naval magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance

4 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

5

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

6 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Housing, \$1,-

7 602,000.

8 Naval receiving station, Charleston, South Carolina:

9 Housing, \$1,225,000.

10 Naval training center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training

11 facilities, and housing, \$5,598,000.

12 Naval training center, San Diego, California: Training

13 facilities, and housing, \$5,375,000.

14

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

15 Naval communication station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-

16 ational facilities, \$443,000.

17 Naval communication station, Newport, Rhode Island:

18 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

19 Naval communication station, San Diego, California:

20 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

21 Naval communication center, Stockton, California: Op-

22 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

23 Naval radio station, Washington County, Maine: Op-

24 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

1 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

2 Naval research laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
3 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

4 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

5 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
6 000.

7 Public works center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
8 244,000.

9 Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme,
10 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
11 \$759,000.

12 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

13 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

14 Naval shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
15 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
16 076,000.

17 Naval base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Main-
18 tenance facilities, hospital facilities, housing and community
19 facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

20 Naval station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
21 Housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
22 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

1 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

2 Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
3 munity facilities, and family housing, \$4,665,000.

4 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
5 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administration facilities and
6 utilities, \$332,000.

7 Naval station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,-
8 699,000.

9 Naval station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
10 000.

11 AVIATION FACILITIES

12 Naval air station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
13 erational facilities, \$428,000.

14 Naval station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and
15 community facilities, \$13,778,000.

16 Naval air station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
17 Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$2,088,000.

18 Naval air station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
19 Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

20 Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational
21 facilities, \$5,730,000.

22 Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory
23 of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

24 Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
25 facilities, \$69,000.

1 Naval station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
2 Operational facilities, \$69,000.

3 Naval air facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities
4 at White Beach, \$504,000.

5 Naval air station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
6 tional facilities, maintenance facilities, housing, utilities, and
7 land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

8 SUPPLY FACILITIES

9 Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
10 \$1,550,000.

11 Naval station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
12 facilities, \$884,000.

13 Naval supply depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
14 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000

15 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

16 Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
17 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
18 \$904,000.

19 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

20 Naval communication station, Adak, Alaska: Housing,
21 \$1,053,000.

22 Naval station, Argentia, Canada: Operational facilities,
23 and housing, \$898,000.

1 Naval communication station, Finegayan, Guam: Hous-
2 ing, \$594,000.

3 Naval security group activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Oper-
4 ational facilities, and housing, \$130,000.

5 Naval security group activity, Sakata, Japan: Opera-
6 tional facilities, \$69,000.

7 Naval security group activity, southern Japan: Opera-
8 tional facilities, housing, and utilities and ground improve-
9 ments, \$726,000.

10 Naval radio station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
11 waii: Operational facilities, \$4,392,000.

12 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

13 Public works center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
14 \$1,093,000.

15 Public works center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Is-
16 lands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$67,490,000.

23 SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
24 or develop research and development installations and facili-
25 ties by proceeding with construction made necessary by new

1 and unforeseen research and development requirements,
2 if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such
3 construction for inclusion in the next military construction
4 authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of
5 national security, and in connection therewith to acquire,
6 construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or
7 temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
8 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the
9 total amount of \$5,000,000. The Secretary of the Navy,
10 or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Serv-
11 ices of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately
12 upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of
13 construction of any public work undertaken under this
14 section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

15 SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
16 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-
17 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES",
19 with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000"
20 and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

21 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
22 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-
23 397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

24 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
25 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of

1 section 402 the amounts “\$138,183,000”, “\$86,397,-
2 000”, and “\$256,875,000” and inserting respectively in
3 place thereof, “\$139,143,000”, “\$95,489,000”, and
4 “\$266,927,000”.

5 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
6 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
7 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

8 Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES” with
9 respect to the naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Cali-
10 fornia, strike out “\$225,000” and insert in place thereof
11 “\$369,000”; with respect to the Marine Corps air station,
12 El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in
13 place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the naval
14 air station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and
15 insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.

16 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
17 amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-
18 358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

19 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
21 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-
22 807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,
23 555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

1 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
2 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
3 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

4 (1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,
5 with respect to the naval repair facility, San Diego, Cali-
6 fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof
7 “\$1,099,000”.

8 (2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
9 with respect to the naval station, Orange, Texas, strike out
10 “\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.

11 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
12 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the naval
13 auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out “\$3,686,-
14 000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,292,000”; and with
15 respect to the naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, Loui-
16 siana, strike out “\$24,361,000” and insert in place thereof
17 “\$26,871,000”.

18 (4) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
19 (Fleet Support Air Stations)”, with respect to the naval
20 air station, Alameda, California, strike out “\$3,729,000”
21 and insert in place thereof “\$4,217,000”; with respect to
22 the naval air station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
23 “\$2,581,000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,355,000”;

1 and with respect to the outlying field, Whitehouse Field,
2 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
3 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

4 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
5 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the naval
6 air station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,000"
7 and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

8 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
9 with respect to the naval ordnance aerophysics laboratory,
10 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
11 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the naval
12 ordnance test station, Inyokern, California, strike out
13 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

14 (7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
15 TIES" with respect to the naval powder factory, Indian Head
16 Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place thereof
17 "\$879,000".

18 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
19 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

21 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
22 with respect to the naval station, Kwajelein, Marshall Islands,
23 strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,-
24 235,000".

25 (2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILI-

1 TIES", with respect to the naval communication facility, Port
 2 Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and in-
 3 sert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

4 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 5 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,-
 6 342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

7 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 8 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 9 tion 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300",
 10 "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting re-
 11 spectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300",
 12 "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

13 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 14 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
 15 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

16 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
 17 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California,
 18 strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,-
 19 169,000".

20 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
 21 with respect to the naval station, Long Beach, California,
 22 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
 23 623,000"; and with respect to the naval station, Norfolk,
 24 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
 25 "\$3,340,000".

1 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
2 (Fleet Support Air Stations)”, with respect to the naval
3 air station, Miramar, California, strike out “\$8,835,000” and
4 insert in place thereof “\$11,040,000”.

5 (4) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
6 (Special Purpose Air Stations)”, with respect to the naval
7 air missile test center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
8 “\$1,682,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,010,000”.

9 (5) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
10 TIES” with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
11 land, strike out “\$7,469,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$10,919,000”.

13 (6) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-
14 ITIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
15 San Francisco, California, strike out “\$2,029,000” and in-
16 sert in place thereof “\$3,779,000”.

17 (7) Under the subheading “YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
18 TIES”, with respect to the public works center, Norfolk,
19 Virginia, strike out “\$443,000” and insert in place thereof
20 “\$500,000”.

21 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
22 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES”
23 in section 201, as follows:

1 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES",
 2 with respect to the naval air station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
 3 out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 5 amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and
 6 inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

7 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 8 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
 9 amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000",
 10 and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place
 11 thereof "\$303,410,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000",
 12 and "\$451,350,000".

13 TITLE III

14 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
 15 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-
 16 ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
 17 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
 18 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
 19 ing projects:

20 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

21 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

22 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Opera-
 23 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,

1 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$4,499,000.

3 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Op-
4 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
5 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$723,000.

6 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facili-
7 ties, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and
8 land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

9 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
11 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family
12 housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,232,000.

14 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
15 Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
16 cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$5,079,000.

18 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
19 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
20 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
21 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

22 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
23 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
24 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

1 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
2 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
3 ground improvements, \$1,118,000.

4 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
5 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
6 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
7 \$905,000.

8 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
9 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
10 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
11 \$1,299,000.

12 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

15 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
16 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

17 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
20 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$6,889,000.

22 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
23 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
24 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

1 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
2 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
3 and ground improvements, \$10,911,000.

4 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-
5 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
6 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
7 improvements, \$2,082,000.

8 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land ac-
9 quisition, \$136,000.

10 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
11 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
12 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
13 \$4,328,000.

14 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
15 Community facilities, \$244,000.

16 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
17 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
18 ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

19 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
20 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
21 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

22 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-
23 tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

24 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply

1 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
2 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

3 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
4 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
5 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

6 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
7 utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improve-
8 ments, \$1,024,000.

9 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
10 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
11 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

12 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
15 and ground improvements, \$2,909,000.

16 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
17 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
18 \$217,000.

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
21 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
22 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
23 sition, \$48,178,000.

1 UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

2 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs,
3 Colorado: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
4 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-
5 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
6 \$21,341,000.

7 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

8 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
9 housing, \$405,000.

10 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
11 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
12 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
13 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
14 and land acquisition, \$10,675,000.

15 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
16 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

17 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
18 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
19 \$899,000.

20 Mallory Air Force Station, Memphis, Tennessee:
21 Operational and training facilities, \$1,561,000.

22 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
23 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

1 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
4 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
5 ments, \$5,042,000.

6 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
7 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

8 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
10 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
11 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

12 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:
13 Community facilities, \$56,000.

14 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
15 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop
16 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

17 Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Operational
18 and training facilities, \$1,960,000.

19 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:
20 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
21 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
22 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
23 \$2,096,000.

1 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

2 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research
3 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community
4 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
5 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

6 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

7 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test
9 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
10 provements, \$1,987,000.

11 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
12 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
13 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

15 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
16 Community facilities, \$206,000.

17 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
18 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
19 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

20 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

1 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
2 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
3 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
4 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
5 ments, \$2,988,000.

6 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

7 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
8 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
9 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
10 and land acquisition, \$5,109,000.

11 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
12 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

13 Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Land ac-
14 quisition, \$8,000.

15 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
17 \$489,000.

18 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
19 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

20 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Com-
21 munity facilities, \$191,000.

22 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
24 ties, \$2,209,000.

1 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
2 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
3 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

4 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
6 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
7 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

8 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
9 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
10 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

11 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
12 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
13 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

14 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
15 facilities, \$436,000.

16 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
17 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

18 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
20 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

21 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
23 \$5,909,000.

24 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community

1 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition,
2 and real estate improvements, \$1,480,000.

3 Sheppard Air Force Base , Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
5 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
6 \$4,442,000.

7 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
8 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

9 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
11 \$1,977,000.

12 Vincent Air Force Base, Yuma, Arizona: Operational
13 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
14 administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop
15 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
16 ments, and land acquisition, \$13,156,000.

17 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
18 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
19 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements,
20 \$4,118,000.

21 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-
22 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
23 \$865,000.

1

AIR UNIVERSITY

2

3

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land acquisition, \$300,000.

4

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

5

6

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, \$247,000.

7

8

9

Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$963,000.

10

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

11

12

Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis, Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$60,000.

13

14

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

15

16

17

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,216,000.

18

19

20

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,089,000.

21

22

23

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$595,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$848,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,344,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,487,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$5,557,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$11,516,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$10,009,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,249,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facili-
9 ties, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and
10 real estate improvements, \$3,326,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

1 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, \$250,000.

3 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
4 acquisition, \$37,000.

5 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
6 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

8 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
10 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

11 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
12 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
13 ground improvements, \$936,000.

14 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
15 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
16 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

17 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop
19 housing, \$2,372,000.

20 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
21 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
22 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

23 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
24 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-

ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,271,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$931,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,892,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,528,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply

1 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
2 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

3 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
4 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
5 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
6 \$2,073,000.

7 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-
8 ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
9 \$235,000.

10 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

11 Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Mainte-
12 nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
14 acquisition, \$2,149,000.

15 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
16 Operational and training facilities, troop housing and com-
17 munity facilities, \$1,623,000.

18 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,-
20 558,000.

21 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
22 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land ac-
23 quisition, \$760,000.

24 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply
25 facilities, and communitiy facilities, \$2,478,000.

1 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply
2 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

3 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
4 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
5 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
6 \$1,204,000.

7 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
8 facilities, \$745,000.

9 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
10 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
11 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
12 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
13 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,535,000.

14 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
15 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

16 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$3,252,000.

18 SPECIAL FACILITIES

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 \$229,000.

21 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
24 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family

1 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
2 ments, and land acquisition, \$22,148,000.

3 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

4 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

5 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
6 ties, \$430,000.

7 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
8 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
9 \$4,742,000.

10 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
11 \$350,000.

12 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
15 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
16 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisi-
17 tion, \$11,500,000.

18 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

21 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

22 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
23 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,642,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$17,024,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$2,975,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$59,613,000.

1 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
4 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
5 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
6 improvements, \$34,960,000.

7 SPECIAL FACILITIES

8 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
9 \$170,000.

10 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
13 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-
14 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
15 \$70,000,000.

16 RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TEST FACILITIES

17 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facili-
19 ties, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and
20 medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities
21 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,000,000.

22 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
23 or develop classified military installations and facilities by
24 acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-
25 stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land

1 acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and
2 equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

3 SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
4 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
5 UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

6 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with
7 respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, Cali-
8 fornia, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof
9 "\$584,000".

10 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—
11 with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Okla-
12 homa, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof
13 "\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in
14 place thereof "\$2,756,000".

15 Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
16 MAND"—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
17 stead, New York, strike out "\$729,000" and insert in place
18 thereof "\$929,000"; and strike out "\$686,000" and insert
19 in place thereof "\$886,000".

20 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
21 COMMAND"—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
22 Muroc, California, strike out "\$27,478,000" and insert in
23 place thereof "\$29,442,000"; and strike out "\$16,192,000"
24 and insert in place thereof "\$18,156,000".

25 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
2 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
3 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
4 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
6 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
7 NENTAL UNITED STATES”, as follows:

8 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

9 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
10 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

12 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-
13 kota, strike out “\$7,709,000” and insert in place thereof
14 “\$9,220,000”;

15 (3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
16 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,029,000 and in-
17 sert in place thereof “\$2,195,000”;

18 (4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike
19 out “\$6,603,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,268,-
20 000”;

21 (5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-
22 nard, California, strike out “\$2,445,000” and insert in
23 place thereof “\$2,935,000”;

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out “\$5,526,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,445,000”;

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out “\$742,000” and insert in place thereof “\$893,000”;

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Arizona, strike out “\$2,107,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,676,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama, strike out “\$4,170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,728,000”;

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out “\$15,803,000” and insert in place thereof “\$16,654,000”;

(3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;

(4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.

1 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

2 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
3 Houston, Texas, strike out "\$3,438,000" and insert
4 in place thereof "\$3,876,000";

5 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
6 San Angelo, Texas, strike out "\$4,081,000" and insert
7 in place thereof "\$5,088,000";

8 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
9 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out "\$500,000" and insert
10 in place thereof "\$545,000";

11 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
12 Harlingen, Texas, strike out "\$446,000" and insert
13 in place thereof "\$529,000";

14 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
15 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$883,000" and insert
16 in place thereof "\$1,129,000";

17 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,
18 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and
19 insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

20 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
21 bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in
22 place thereof "\$1,304,000";

(8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place thereof "\$825,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada, strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,500".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,363,000".

(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,218,000";

(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,473,000";

1 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
 2 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
 3 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

4 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

5 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
 6 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
 7 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

8 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
 9 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
 10 thereof “\$611,000”;

11 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
 12 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
 13 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

14 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
 15 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
 16 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

17 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
 18 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
 19 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

20 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 21 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
 22 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

23 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—
 24 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
 25 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

1 Under the subheading "AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL
2 AIDS"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$526,-
3 000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,394,000".

4 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
5 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
6 tion 502 the amounts "\$801,256,000", "\$532,454,000",
7 and "\$1,339,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$824,-
8 300,000", "\$533,539,000", and "\$1,363,189,000", re-
9 spectively.

10 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
11 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
12 STATES" in section 301, as follows:

13 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

14 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
15 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$863,000" and insert in
16 place thereof "\$1,469,000";

17 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
18 ington, strike out "\$2,827,000" and insert in place
19 thereof "\$3,079,000";

20 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
21 gow, Montana, strike out "\$2,470,000" and insert in
22 place thereof "\$3,080,000";

23 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
24 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$18,969,000"
25 and insert in place thereof "\$30,521,000";

1 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
2 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-
3 sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;

4 (6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
5 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and
6 insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;

7 (7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
8 port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”
9 and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;

10 (8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
11 North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in
12 place thereof “\$27,035,000”;

13 (9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
14 port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”
15 and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;

16 (10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
17 Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-
18 sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;

19 (11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
20 Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;

22 (12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-
23 consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$8,726,000”;

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out “\$3,278,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,808,000”;

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out “\$21,510,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,201,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out “\$17,966,000” and insert in place thereof “\$22,005,000”;

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out “\$473,000” and insert in place thereof “\$745,000”;

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof “\$251,000”;

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out “\$5,990,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,763,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out “\$17,121,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,471,000”;

(2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,

1 Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place
2 thereof "\$22,000";

3 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
4 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and
5 insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

6 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
7 Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place
8 thereof "\$3,063,000";

9 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
10 Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place
11 thereof "\$1,064,000".

12 Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY"—with respect
13 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
14 out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

15 Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
16 MAND"—

17 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
18 ville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert
19 in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

20 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
21 etta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place
22 thereof, "\$500,000".

23 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
24 COMMAND"—

25 (1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field,

Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out “\$6,939,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,530,000”;

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out “\$5,488,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,220,000”.

Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out “\$922,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,190,000”;

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out “\$2,179,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,643,000”;

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out “\$14,518,000” and insert in place thereof “\$15,322,000”;

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out “\$943,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,075,000”;

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out “\$1,694,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,966,000”;

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

(7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,

1 Great Falls, Montana, strike out “\$1,236,000” and
 2 insert in place thereof “\$1,586,000”;

3 (8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
 4 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$2,064,000”
 5 and insert in place thereof “\$2,607,000”;

6 (9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
 7 Nebraska, strike out “\$5,697,000” and insert in place
 8 thereof “\$6,155,000”;

9 (10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,
 10 Plattsburgh, New York, strike out “\$1,491,000” and
 11 insert in place thereof “\$2,027,000”;

12 (11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
 13 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$661,000”
 14 and insert in place thereof “\$720,000”;

15 (12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,
 16 Roswell, New Mexico, strike out “\$2,791,000” and
 17 insert in place thereof “\$3,181,000”.

18 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—
 19 with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-
 20 ginia, strike out “\$2,613,000” and insert in place thereof
 21 “\$2,785,000”.

22 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 23 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED
 24 STATES” as follows:

25 Under the subheading “NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND”—

1 with respect to various locations, strike out “\$75,650,000”
2 and insert in place thereof “\$94,197,000”.

3 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
4 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
5 amounts “\$742,873,000”, “\$405,061,000”, and “\$1,360,-
6 934,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$811,342,000”,
7 “\$423,608,000”, and “\$1,447,950,000”, respectively.

8 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
9 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
10 read as follows:

11 “(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
12 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
13 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
14 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
15 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
16 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
17 in the next military construction authorization Act would
18 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
19 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
20 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
21 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
22 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
23 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
24 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the
25 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon

1 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
2 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
3 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.”

4 TITLE IV

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
7 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
8 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
9 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
10 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.
11 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
12 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
13 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.
14 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
15 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
16 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.
17 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
18 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
19 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
20 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

21 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such
22 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
23 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
24 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

25 (1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$128,-

821,000; outside the United States, \$46,502,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; section 103, \$5,000,000; or a total of \$323,325,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$281,337,000; outside the United States, \$81,272,000; section 202, \$67,490,000; section 203, \$5,000,000; or a total of \$435,099,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$509,286,000; outside the United States, \$228,628,000; section 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$802,914,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller

1 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
2 quately auditing those contracts; the President may
3 exempt those contracts from the requirements of that
4 section.

5 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
6 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
7 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
8 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
9 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
10 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
11 551).

12 SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
13 may acquire any interest in land that—

14 (1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
15 interest of national defense; and

16 (2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive
17 of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
18 judgments).

19 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the
20 same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that
21 together cost more than \$25,000.

22 (b) Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70
23 Stat. 991, 1015) is hereby repealed.

24 SEC. 407. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
25 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary.

1 of a military department in connection with the establish-
2 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
3 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
4 contained in Acts approved before August 8, 1953, and
5 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
6 tion are repealed, except—

7 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
8 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
9 titles that contain the general provisions;

10 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
11 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
12 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
13 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

14 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
15 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
16 contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-
17 second Congress;

18 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
19 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
20 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
21 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

22 (5) the authorization for the development of the
23 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
24 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
25 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress.

1 (6) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
2 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
3 the authorization for (a) development of classified fa-
4 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
5 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
6 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified
7 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
8 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
9 (66 Stat. 606, 609).

10 SEC. 408. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69
11 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read
12 as follows:

13 “SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
14 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
15 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
16 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
17 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
18 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
19 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
20 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
21 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
22 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
23 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
24 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-

1 appropriations available for maintenance and operation but
2 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.”

3 SEC. 409. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
4 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-
5 ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor
6 area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774,
7 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

8 (b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68
9 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

10 SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
11 follows:

12 (a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following
13 new subsection at the end thereof:

14 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
15 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
16 the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
17 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

18 (b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following
19 new subsection at the end thereof:

20 “(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
21 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members
22 of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
23 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

1 (c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following
2 new subsection at the end thereof:

3 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
4 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
5 the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net
6 floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

7 SEC. 411. Section 419 of the Act of August 3, 1956
8 (70 Stat. 991, 1018) is amended to read as follows:

9 “SEC. 419. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this
10 Act or of any other provision of law except a provision of
11 law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, no con-
12 tract shall be entered into by the United States for the con-
13 struction or acquisition of family housing units under title IV
14 of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, by or for
15 the use of military or civilian personnel of any of the military
16 services unless—

17 “(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to
18 the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of
19 the House of Representatives a written report stating
20 the intent to construct or acquire such units, certifying
21 that the number of units to be constructed or acquired is
22 consistent with the long range troop strength to be sta-
23 tioned at the location of such units, and showing the
24 location, number, and estimated cost of such housing
25 units, and the existing housing at such location; and

1 “(2) a fifteen-day period has elapsed since the
2 submission of such report.”

3 SEC. 412. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
4 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
5 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

6 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
7 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
8 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
9 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
10 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
11 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
12 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
13 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
14 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
15 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
16 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
17 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
18 acquisition.”

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. SATRONSTADT.

MAY 1, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

H. R. 7130

TO AMEND THE SEVERAL ACTS RELATIVE TO THE

NAVY

And to amend the several Acts relating to the Navy, and to amend the several Acts relating to the Navy, and to amend the several Acts relating to the Navy.

A BILL

For the purpose of amending the several Acts relating to the Navy, and to amend the several Acts relating to the Navy, and to amend the several Acts relating to the Navy.

Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives

of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

1861.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7130

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 2, 1957

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
7 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
8 tion, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following
9 projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
\$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,-
000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,-
000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
\$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,-
530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

1 Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:
2 Land acquisition, \$40,000.

3 Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,
4 and utilities, \$110,000.

5 Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,
6 and land acquisition, \$95,000.

7 (Chemical Corps)

8 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-
10 000.

11 (Signal Corps)

12 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

13 (Corps of Engineers)

14 Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-
15 search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

16 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training
17 facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

18 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
19 000.

20 (Transportation Corps)

21 Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
22 \$1,169,000.

23 Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
24 facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
14 utilities, \$6,866,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

1 (Third Army Area)

2 Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and main-
3 tenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

4 Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and mainte-
5 nance facilities, \$1,051,000.

6 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, main-
7 tenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities,
8 \$5,117,000.

9 Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop
10 housing, \$7,549,000.

11 Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

12 (Fourth Army Area)

13 Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facili-
14 ties, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility,
15 administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,
16 and utilities, \$7,704,000.

17 Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facili-
18 ties, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, com-
19 munity facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

20 Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, mainte-
21 nance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

22 (Fifth Army Area)

23 Fort Carson, Colorado: Troop housing and utilities,
24 \$3,022,000.

1 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

2 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance
3 facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

4 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing,
5 \$4,663,000.

6 (Sixth Army Area)

7 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance
8 facilities, administrative facilities, community facility,
9 and utilities, \$1,487,000.

10 Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance
11 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,066,000.

12 (Military Academy)

13 United States Military Academy, New York: Utilities,
14 \$1,666,000.

15 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

16 Various installations: Operational facility, community
17 facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

18 (Tactical Installations)

19 Various locations: Family housing, \$1,736,000.

20 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

21 Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance fa-
22 cilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community
23 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general: Family housing, \$658,000.

Eielson Air Force Base: Administrative facility,
\$248,000.

Fort Greely: Maintenance facility, \$891,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Family housing, \$1,878,000.

Fort Richardson: Operational facilities, maintenance facility, family housing, and utilities, \$6,447,000.

Tactical installations: Family housing, \$4,910,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities,
\$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and
utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing,

1 community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facili-
2 ties, and utilities, \$10,000,000.

3 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or
4 develop classified military installations and facilities by ac-
5 quiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing
6 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
7 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
8 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

9 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or
10 develop research and development installations and facilities
11 by proceeding with construction made necessary by new and
12 unforeseen research and development requirements, if the
13 Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such con-
14 struction for inclusion in the next military construction au-
15 thorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national
16 security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct,
17 convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary
18 public works, including land acquisition, site preparation,
19 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount
20 of \$5,000,000. The Secretary of the Army, or his designee,
21 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Sen-
22 ate and House of Representatives immediately upon reach-
23 ing a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction

1 of any public work undertaken under this section, including
2 those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

3 SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
4 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
5 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
6 military tactical installations for assignment as public
7 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
8 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
9 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
10 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
11 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
12 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
13 structed with appropriated funds.

14 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
15 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
16 STATES" in section 101, as follows: under the subheading
17 "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)",
18 with respect to Red River Arsenal, Texas, strike out
19 "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,212,000".

20 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
21 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
22 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and

1 inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,-
2 000", respectively.

3 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
4 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
5 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

6 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
7 TIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Department of the
8 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
9 land, strike out "\$2,360,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$3,137,000".

11 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Military Academy)" with respect to United States Military
13 Academy, New York, strike out "\$9,950,000" and insert
14 in place thereof "\$11,983,000".

15 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
16 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
17 tion 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000"
18 and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,-
19 870,000", respectively.

20 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
21 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
22 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

23 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
24 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,039,000".

(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$212,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,874,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof "\$525,000".

(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,491,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,240,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike

1 out “\$6,597,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,-
2 072,000”.

3 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES (Med-
4 ical Corps)”—

5 (1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
6 Texas, strike out “\$549,000” and insert in place thereof
7 “\$876,000”.

8 (2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash-
9 ington, strike out “\$333,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$669,000”.

11 (3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
12 Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$3,557,000”
13 and insert in place thereof “\$4,472,000”.

14 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sec-
15 ond Army Area)”—with respect to Fort Holabird, Mary-
16 land, strike out “\$612,000” and insert in place thereof
17 “\$800,000”.

18 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
19 (Fourth Army Area)”—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
20 strike out “\$12,922,000” and insert in place thereof
21 “\$14,283,000”.

22 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
23 (Fifth Army Area)”—

1 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
2 out “\$7,487,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,621,-
3 000”.

4 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
5 strike out “\$8,615,000” and insert in place thereof
6 “\$9,893,000”.

7 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
8 out “\$145,000” and insert in place thereof “\$193,000”.

9 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
10 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)”—with respect
11 to various installations, strike out “\$3,014,000” and insert
12 in place thereof “\$3,204,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
14 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
15 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101 as follows:

16 Under the subheading “Alaskan Area”—with respect to
17 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out “\$469,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$559,000”.

19 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
21 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and
22 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$234,820,-
23 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$543,887,000”, respectively.

1 SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress
2 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
3 STATES" in section 101 as follows:

4 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
5 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

6 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
7 York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$136,000".

9 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
10 strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$8,593,000".

12 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
13 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—

14 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
15 out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000".

16 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
17 Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place
18 thereof "\$1,847,000".

19 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
20 (Fourth Army Area)"—

21 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
22 "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000".

23 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
24 "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

25 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,

1 strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof
2 "\$1,373,000".

3 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,-
5 783,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000".

6 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
8 tion 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and
9 "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,-
10 000", "\$203,331,000", and "\$334,104,000", respectively.

11 TITLE II

12 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
13 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
14 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
15 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
16 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
17 projects:

18 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

19 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

20 Naval engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Mary-
21 land: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

22 Naval shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock,
23 \$25,438,000.

24 Naval shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
25 \$1,452,000.

1 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland:
2 Utilities, \$115,000.

3 Naval shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
4 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$4,660,000.

5 Naval submarine base, New London, Connecticut:
6 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

7 Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,998,000.

8 Naval shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
9 facilities, \$391,000.

10 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

11 Naval station, Key West, Florida: Housing, \$1,326,000.

12 Naval station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
13 facilities, \$544,000.

14 Naval station, Newport, Rhode Island: Housing, com-
15 munity facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

16 Naval base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
17 \$7,808,000.

18 AVIATION FACILITIES

19 (Naval Air Training Stations)

20 Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Opera-
21 tional facilities, \$566,000.

22 Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational
23 facilities, \$140,000.

24 Naval air station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

1 Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-
2 tional facilities, \$160,000.

3 Navy auxiliary air station, Meridian, Mississippi:
4 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,-
5 067,000.

6 Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, Louisiana:
7 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

8 Naval air station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facili-
9 ties, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

10 Navy auxiliary air station, Saufley Field, Florida:
11 Operational facilities, \$39,000.

12 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

13 Naval air station, Alameda, California: Operational
14 facilities, \$185,000.

15 Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

17 Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
18 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
19 \$7,751,000.

20 Naval air station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational
21 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.

22 Naval auxiliary landing field, Crows Landing, Califor-
23 nia: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

1 Naval auxiliary air station, Edenton, North Carolina:
2 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

3 Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, California: Opera-
4 tional facilities, housing, and land acquisition, \$4,774,000.

5 Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational
6 facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

7 Naval seaplane facility, Hertford, North Carolina: Oper-
8 ational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities, hous-
9 ing, and utilities, \$8,051,000.

10 Naval air station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
11 facilities, \$39,000.

12 Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Operational fa-
13 cilities, \$130,000.

14 Naval air station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
15 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

16 Naval auxiliary air station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
17 tional facilities, \$384,000.

18 Naval air station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
19 cilities, \$3,401,000.

20 Naval air station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
21 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

22 Naval air station, North Island, San Diego, California:
23 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

24 Naval air station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and

1 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
2 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

3 Naval air station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
4 tional facilities, \$882,000.

5 Naval auxiliary landing field, San Clemente Island,
6 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
7 utilities, \$9,448,000.

8 Naval air facility, South San Diego Bay, California:
9 Waterfront facilities, \$6,795,000.

10 Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Opera-
11 tional facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,433,000.

12 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

13 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South
14 Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
15 istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

16 Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
17 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
18 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
19 improvements, \$6,503,000.

20 Marine Corps air station, El Toro, California: Opera-
21 tional facilities, \$3,736,000.

22 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, California:
23 Operational facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$7,-
24 080,000.

1 Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina:
2 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

3 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

4 Naval air development center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania:
5 Operational facilities, \$39,000.

6 Naval air station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-
7 tional facilities, \$2,209,000.

8 Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, California:
9 Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San
10 Nicolas Island) and land acquisition, \$7,669,000.

11 SUPPLY FACILITIES

12 Electronics supply office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Admin-
13 istrative facilities, \$92,000.

14 Naval ordnance supply office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsyl-
15 vania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

16 Aviation supply office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ad-
17 ministrative facilities, \$550,000.

18 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

19 Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Georgia: Com-
20 munity facilities, \$140,000.

21 Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, California: Main-
22 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,
23 and utilities, \$8,001,000.

24 Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina:

1 Operational and training facilities, medical facilities, troop
2 housing, and utilities, \$5,147,000.

3 Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
4 lina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facili-
5 ties, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

6 Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
7 tional facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

8 Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community
9 facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
10 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

11 Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California:
12 Training facilities, \$116,000.

13 Marine Corps training center, Twenty-Nine Palms,
14 California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-
15 istrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

16 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

17 Naval ammunition depot, Bangor, Washington: Utili-
18 ties, \$316,000.

19 Naval ordnance test station, China Lake, California:
20 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

21 Naval ordnance laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
22 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

23 Ordnance aerophysics laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
24 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

1 Applied physics laboratory, Howard County, Maryland:

2 Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

3 Naval magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance

4 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

5 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

6 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Housing, \$1,-

7 602,000.

8 Naval receiving station, Charleston, South Carolina:

9 Housing, \$1,225,000.

10 Naval training center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training

11 facilities, and housing, \$5,598,000.

12 Naval training center, San Diego, California: Training

13 facilities, and housing, \$5,375,000.

14 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

15 Naval communication station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-

16 ational facilities, \$443,000.

17 Naval communication station, Newport, Rhode Island:

18 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

19 Naval communication station, San Diego, California:

20 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

21 Naval communication center, Stockton, California: Op-

22 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

23 Naval radio station, Washington County, Maine: Op-

24 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

1 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

2 Naval research laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
3 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

4 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

5 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
6 000.

7 Public works center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
8 244,000.

9 Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme,
10 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
11 \$759,000.

12 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

13 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

14 Naval shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
15 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
16 076,000.

17 Naval base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Main-
18 tenance facilities, hospital facilities, housing and community
19 facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

20 Naval station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
21 Housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
22 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

1

2 Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
3 munity facilities, and family housing, \$4,665,000.

4 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
5 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administrative facilities and
6 utilities, \$332,000.

7 Naval station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,-
8 699,000.

9 Naval station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
10 000.

11 AVIATION FACILITIES

12 Naval air station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
13 erational facilities, \$428,000.

14 Naval station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and
15 community facilities, \$13,778,000.

16 Naval air station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
17 Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$2,088,000.

18 Naval air station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
19 Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

20 Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational
21 facilities, \$5,730,000.

22 Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory
23 of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

24 Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
25 facilities, \$69,000.

1 Naval station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
2 Operational facilities, \$69,000.

3 Naval air facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities
4 at White Beach, \$504,000.

5 Naval air station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Opera-
6 tional facilities, maintenance facilities, housing, utilities, and
7 land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

8 SUPPLY FACILITIES

9 Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
10 \$1,550,000.

11 Naval station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
12 facilities, \$884,000.

13 Naval supply depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
14 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000

15 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

16 Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
17 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
18 \$904,000.

19 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

20 Naval communication station, Adak, Alaska: Housing,
21 \$1,053,000.

22 Naval station, Argentia, Canada: Operational facilities,
23 and housing, \$898,000.

1 Naval communication station, Finegayan, Guam, Mari-
2 ana Islands: Housing, \$594,000.

3 Naval security group activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Oper-
4 ational facilities, and housing, \$130,000.

5 Naval security group activity, Sakata, Japan: Opera-
6 tional facilities, \$69,000.

7 Naval security group activity, southern Japan: Opera-
8 tional facilities, housing, and utilities and ground improve-
9 ments, \$726,000.

10 Naval radio station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
11 waii: Operational facilities, \$4,392,000.

12 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

13 Public works center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
14 \$1,093,000.

15 Public works center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Is-
16 lands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

17 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
18 develop classified naval installations and facilities by con-
19 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
20 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
21 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
22 total amount of \$67,490,000.

23 SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
24 or develop research and development installations and facili-
25 ties by proceeding with construction made necessary by new

1 and unforeseen research and development requirements,
2 if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such
3 construction for inclusion in the next military construction
4 authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of
5 national security, and in connection therewith to acquire,
6 construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or
7 temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
8 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the
9 total amount of \$5,000,000. The Secretary of the Navy,
10 or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Serv-
11 ices of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately
12 upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of
13 construction of any public work undertaken under this
14 section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

15 SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
16 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-
17 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES",
19 with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000"
20 and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

21 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
22 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-
23 397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

24 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
25 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of

1 section 402 the amounts “\$138,183,000”, “\$86,397,-
2 000”, and “\$256,875,000” and inserting respectively in
3 place thereof, “\$139,143,000”, “\$95,489,000”, and
4 “\$266,927,000”.

5 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
6 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
7 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

8 Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES” with
9 respect to the naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Cali-
10 fornia, strike out “\$225,000” and insert in place thereof
11 “\$369,000”; with respect to the Marine Corps air station,
12 El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in
13 place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the naval
14 air station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and
15 insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.

16 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
17 amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-
18 358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

19 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
21 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-
22 807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,
23 555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

1 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
2 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
3 UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

4 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES",
5 with respect to the naval repair facility, San Diego, Cali-
6 fornia, strike out "\$629,000" and insert in place thereof
7 "\$1,099,000".

8 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
9 with respect to the naval station, Orange, Texas, strike out
10 "\$399,000" and insert in place thereof "\$563,000".

11 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
12 (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the naval
13 auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out "\$3,686,-
14 000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with
15 respect to the naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, Loui-
16 siana, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place thereof
17 "\$26,871,000".

18 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
19 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the naval
20 air station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000"
21 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
22 the naval air station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
23 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";

1 and with respect to the outlying field, Whitehouse Field,
2 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
3 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

4 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
5 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the naval
6 air station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,000"
7 and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

8 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
9 with respect to the naval ordnance aerophysics laboratory,
10 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
11 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the naval
12 ordnance test station, Inyokern, California, strike out
13 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

14 (7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
15 TIES" with respect to the naval powder factory, Indian Head
16 Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place thereof
17 "\$879,000".

18 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
19 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

21 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
22 with respect to the naval station, Kwajelein, Marshall Islands,
23 strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,-
24 235,000".

25 (2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILI-

1 TIES", with respect to the naval communication facility, Port
 2 Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and in-
 3 sert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

4 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 5 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,-
 6 342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

7 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 8 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 9 tion 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300",
 10 "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting re-
 11 spectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300",
 12 "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

13 SEC. 207. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 14 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
 15 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

16 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
 17 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California,
 18 strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,-
 19 169,000".

20 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
 21 with respect to the naval station, Long Beach, California,
 22 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
 23 623,000"; and with respect to the naval station, Norfolk,
 24 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
 25 "\$3,340,000".

1 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
2 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the naval
3 air station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000" and
4 insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

5 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
6 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the naval
7 air missile test center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
8 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

9 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
10 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
11 land, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$10,919,000".

13 (6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-
14 ITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
15 San Francisco, California, strike out "\$2,029,000" and in-
16 sert in place thereof "\$3,779,000".

17 (7) Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
18 TIES", with respect to the public works center, Norfolk,
19 Virginia, strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof
20 "\$500,000".

21 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
22 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES"
23 in section 201, as follows:

1 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES",
 2 with respect to the naval air station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
 3 out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 5 amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and
 6 inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

7 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 8 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
 9 amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000",
 10 and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place
 11 thereof "\$303,410,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000",
 12 and "\$451,350,000".

13 TITLE III

14 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
 15 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-
 16 ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
 17 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
 18 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
 19 ing projects:

20 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

21 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

22 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Opera-
 23 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,

1 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$4,499,000.

3 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Op-
4 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
5 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$723,000.

6 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facili-
7 ties, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and
8 land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

9 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
11 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family
12 housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,232,000.

14 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
15 Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
16 cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$5,079,000.

18 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
19 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
20 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
21 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

22 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
23 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
24 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

1 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
2 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
3 ground improvements, \$1,118,000.

4 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
5 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
6 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
7 \$905,000.

8 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
9 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
10 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
11 \$1,299,000.

12 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

15 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
16 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

17 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
20 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$6,889,000.

22 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
23 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
24 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

1 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
2 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
3 and ground improvements, \$10,911,000.

4 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Maintenance
5 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
6 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
7 improvements, \$2,082,000.

8 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land acquisition,
9 \$136,000.

10 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
11 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
12 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
13 \$4,328,000.

14 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
15 Community facilities, \$244,000.

16 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
17 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
18 and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

19 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
20 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
21 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

22 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational
23 and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

24 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply

1 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
2 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

3 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
4 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
5 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

6 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
7 utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improve-
8 ments, \$1,024,000.

9 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
10 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
11 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

12 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
15 and ground improvements, \$2,909,000.

16 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
17 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
18 \$217,000.

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
21 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
22 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
23 sition, \$48,178,000.

1 UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

2 United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs,
3 Colorado: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
4 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-
5 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
6 \$21,341,000.

7 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

8 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
9 housing, \$405,000.

10 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
11 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
12 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
13 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
14 and land acquisition, \$10,675,000.

15 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
16 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

17 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
18 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
19 \$899,000.

20 Mallory Air Force Station, Memphis, Tennessee:
21 Operational and training facilities, \$1,561,000.

22 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
23 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

1 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
4 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
5 ments, \$5,042,000.

6 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
7 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

8 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
10 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
11 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

12 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:
13 Community facilities, \$56,000.

14 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
15 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop
16 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

17 Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Operational
18 and training facilities, \$1,960,000.

19 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:
20 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
21 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
22 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
23 \$2,096,000.

1 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

2 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research
3 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community
4 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
5 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

6 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

7 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test
9 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
10 provements, \$1,987,000.

11 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
12 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
13 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

15 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
16 Community facilities, \$206,000.

17 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
18 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
19 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

20 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

1 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
2 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
3 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
4 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
5 ments, \$2,988,000.

6 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

7 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
8 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
9 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
10 and land acquisition, \$5,109,000.

11 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
12 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

13 Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Land ac-
14 quisition, \$8,000.

15 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
17 \$489,000.

18 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
19 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

20 James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Com-
21 munity facilities, \$191,000.

22 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
24 ties, \$2,209,000.

1 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
2 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
3 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

4 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
6 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
7 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

8 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
9 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
10 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

11 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
12 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
13 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

14 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
15 facilities, \$436,000.

16 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
17 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

18 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
20 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

21 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
23 \$5,909,000.

24 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community

1 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition,
2 and real estate improvements, \$1,480,000.

3 Sheppard Air Force Base , Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
5 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
6 \$4,442,000.

7 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
8 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

9 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
11 \$1,977,000.

12 Vincent Air Force Base, Yuma, Arizona: Operational
13 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
14 administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop
15 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
16 ments, and land acquisition, \$13,156,000.

17 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
18 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
19 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements,
20 \$4,118,000.

21 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-
22 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
23 \$865,000.

1 AIR UNIVERSITY

2 Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land
3 acquisition, \$300,000.

4 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

5 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-
6 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$247,000.

7 Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-
8 ties and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real es-
9 tate improvements, \$963,000.

10 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

11 Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,
12 Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$60,000.

13 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
14 Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

15 Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-
16 lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
17 ments, \$2,216,000.

18 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
19 and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
20 improvements, \$2,089,000.

21 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:
22 Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
23 and land acquisition, \$595,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

1

2 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
3 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
4 facilities, \$848,000.

5 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:
6 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
7 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
8 \$3,344,000.

9 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
11 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and
12 ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

13 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
14 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
15 facilities, \$1,487,000.

16 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
17 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
18 \$5,557,000.

19 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
20 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
21 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
22 land acquisition, \$11,516,000.

23 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$10,009,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,249,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facili-
9 ties, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and
10 real estate improvements, \$3,326,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

1 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, \$250,000.

3 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
4 acquisition, \$37,000.

5 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
6 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

8 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
10 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

11 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
12 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
13 ground improvements, \$936,000.

14 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
15 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
16 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

17 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop
19 housing, \$2,372,000.

20 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
21 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
22 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

23 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
24 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-

1 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
2 improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

3 Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,271,000.

6 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:
7 Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
8 \$931,000.

9 Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-
10 shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
11 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

12 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
13 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
14 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
15 \$3,892,000.

16 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
18 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
19 provements, \$3,528,000.

20 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

23 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply

1 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
2 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

3 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
4 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
5 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
6 \$2,073,000.

7 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-
8 ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
9 \$235,000.

10 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

11 Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Mainte-
12 nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
14 acquisition, \$2,149,000.

15 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
16 Operational and training facilities, troop housing and com-
17 munity facilities, \$1,623,000.

18 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,-
20 558,000.

21 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
22 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land ac-
23 quisition, \$760,000.

24 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply
25 facilities, and communitiy facilities, \$2,478,000.

1 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply
2 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

3 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
4 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
5 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
6 \$1,204,000.

7 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
8 facilities, \$745,000.

9 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
10 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
11 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
12 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
13 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,535,000.

14 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
15 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

16 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$3,252,000.

18 SPECIAL FACILITIES

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 \$229,000.

21 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
24 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family

1 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
2 ments, and land acquisition, \$22,148,000.

3 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

4 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

5 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
6 ties, \$430,000.

7 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training
8 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
9 \$4,742,000.

10 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
11 \$350,000.

12 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
15 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
16 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisi-
17 tion, \$11,500,000.

18 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

19 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
20 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

21 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

22 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
23 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,642,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$17,024,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$2,975,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$59,613,000.

1 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
4 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
5 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
6 improvements, \$34,960,000.

7 SPECIAL FACILITIES

8 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
9 \$170,000.

10 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities; supply facilities, administrative facili-
13 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-
14 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
15 \$70,000,000.

16 RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TEST FACILITIES

17 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
18 maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facili-
19 ties, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and
20 medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities
21 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,000,000.

22 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
23 or develop classified military installations and facilities by
24 acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-
25 stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land

1 acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and
2 equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

3 SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
4 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
5 UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

6 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with
7 respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, Cali-
8 fornia, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof
9 "\$584,000".

10 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—
11 with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Okla-
12 homa, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof
13 "\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in
14 place thereof "\$2,756,000".

15 Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
16 MAND"—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
17 stead, New York, strike out "\$729,000" and insert in place
18 thereof "\$929,000"; and strike out "\$686,000" and insert
19 in place thereof "\$886,000".

20 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
21 COMMAND"—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
22 Muroc, California, strike out "\$27,478,000" and insert in
23 place thereof "\$29,442,000"; and strike out "\$16,192,000"
24 and insert in place thereof "\$18,156,000".

25 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
2 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
3 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
4 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
6 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
7 NENTAL UNITED STATES”, as follows:

8 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

9 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
10 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

12 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-
13 kota, strike out “\$7,709,000” and insert in place thereof
14 “\$9,220,000”;

15 (3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
16 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,029,000 and in-
17 sert in place thereof “\$2,195,000”;

18 (4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike
19 out “\$6,603,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,268,-
20 000”;

21 (5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-
22 nard, California, strike out “\$2,445,000” and insert in
23 place thereof “\$2,935,000”;

1 (6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,
2 Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and
3 insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

4 (7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-
5 port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and in-
6 sert in place thereof "\$893,000";

7 (8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,
8 Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$2,676,000".

10 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

11 (1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,
12 Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert
13 in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

14 (2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,
15 New York, strike out "\$15,803,000" and insert in
16 place thereof "\$16,654,000";

17 (3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,
18 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$9,522,000" and
19 insert in place thereof "\$11,970,000";

20 (4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force
21 Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$12,001,000" and
22 insert in place thereof "\$14,508,000".

1 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

2 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
3 Houston, Texas, strike out "\$3,438,000" and insert
4 in place thereof "\$3,876,000";

5 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
6 San Angelo, Texas, strike out "\$4,081,000" and insert
7 in place thereof "\$5,088,000";

8 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
9 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out "\$500,000 and insert
10 in place thereof "\$545,000";

11 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
12 Harlingen, Texas, strike out "\$446,000" and insert
13 in place thereof "\$529,000";

14 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
15 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$883,000" and insert
16 in place thereof "\$1,129,000";

17 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,
18 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and
19 insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

20 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
21 bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in
22 place thereof "\$1,304,000";

(8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place thereof "\$825,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada, strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,500".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,363,000".

(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,218,000";

(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,473,000";

1 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
 2 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
 3 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

4 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

5 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
 6 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
 7 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

8 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
 9 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
 10 thereof “\$611,000”;

11 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
 12 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
 13 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

14 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
 15 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
 16 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

17 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
 18 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
 19 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

20 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 21 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
 22 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

23 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—
 24 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
 25 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

1 Under the subheading "AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL
2 AIDS"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$526,-
3 000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,394,000".

4 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
5 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
6 tion 502 the amounts "\$801,256,000", "\$532,454,000",
7 and "\$1,339,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$824,-
8 300,000", "\$533,539,000", and "\$1,363,189,000", re-
9 spectively.

10 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
11 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
12 STATES" in section 301, as follows:

13 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

14 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
15 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$863,000" and insert in
16 place thereof "\$1,469,000";

17 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
18 ington, strike out "\$2,827,000" and insert in place
19 thereof "\$3,079,000";

20 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
21 gow, Montana, strike out "\$2,470,000" and insert in
22 place thereof "\$3,080,000";

23 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
24 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$18,969,000"
25 and insert in place thereof "\$30,521,000";

1 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
2 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,673,000" and in-
3 sert in place thereof "\$1,781,000";

4 (6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
5 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,156,000" and
6 insert in place thereof "\$2,336,000";

7 (7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
8 port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out "\$1,130,000"
9 and insert in place thereof "\$1,560,000";

10 (8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
11 North Dakota, strike out "\$21,215,000" and insert in
12 place thereof "\$27,035,000";

13 (9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
14 port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out "\$3,030,000"
15 and insert in place thereof "\$3,409,000";

16 (10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
17 Camarillo, California, strike out "\$2,392,000" and in-
18 sert in place thereof "\$2,779,000";

19 (11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
20 Sioux City, Iowa, strike out "\$2,288,000" and insert
21 in place thereof "\$2,900,000";

22 (12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-
23 consin, strike out "\$4,876,000" and insert in place
24 thereof "\$8,726,000";

1 (13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base,
2 Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "\$3,278,000" and insert in
3 place thereof "\$3,808,000";

4 (14) with respect to various locations, strike out
5 "\$21,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,201,000".

6 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

7 (1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,
8 New York, strike out "\$17,966,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$22,005,000";

10 (2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station,
11 Searsport, Maine, strike out "\$473,000" and insert in
12 place thereof "\$745,000";

13 (3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station,
14 Tacoma, Washington, strike out "\$129,000" and insert
15 in place thereof "\$251,000";

16 (4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Okla-
17 homa City, Oklahoma, strike out "\$5,990,000" and in-
18 sert in place thereof "\$7,763,000".

19 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

20 (1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base,
21 Amarillo, Texas, strike out "\$17,121,000" and insert
22 in place thereof "\$26,471,000";

23 (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,

1 Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place
2 thereof "\$22,000";

3 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
4 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and
5 insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

6 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
7 Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place
8 thereof "\$3,063,000";

9 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
10 Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place
11 thereof "\$1,064,000".

12 Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY"—with respect
13 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
14 out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

15 Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
16 MAND"—

17 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
18 ville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert
19 in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

20 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
21 etta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place
22 thereof, "\$500,000".

23 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
24 COMMAND"—

25 (1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field,

1 Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out “\$6,939,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$7,530,000”;

3 (2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
4 Muroc, California, strike out “\$5,488,000” and insert
5 in place thereof “\$7,220,000”.

6 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

7 (1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso,
8 Texas, strike out “\$922,000” and insert in place thereof
9 “\$1,190,000”;

10 (2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced,
11 California, strike out “\$2,179,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$2,643,000”;

13 (3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base,
14 Columbus, Mississippi, strike out “\$14,518,000” and
15 insert in place thereof “\$15,322,000”;

16 (4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base,
17 Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out “\$943,000” and
18 insert in place thereof “\$1,075,000”;

19 (5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base,
20 Homestead, Florida, strike out “\$1,694,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$1,966,000”;

22 (6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base,
23 Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in
24 place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

25 (7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,

1 Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$1,236,000" and
2 insert in place thereof "\$1,586,000";

3 (8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
4 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$2,064,000"
5 and insert in place thereof "\$2,607,000";

6 (9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
7 Nebraska, strike out "\$5,697,000" and insert in place
8 thereof "\$6,155,000";

9 (10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,
10 Plattsburgh, New York, strike out "\$1,491,000" and
11 insert in place thereof "\$2,027,000";

12 (11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
13 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$661,000"
14 and insert in place thereof "\$720,000";

15 (12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,
16 Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$2,791,000" and
17 insert in place thereof "\$3,181,000".

18 Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—
19 with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-
20 ginia, strike out "\$2,613,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,785,000".

22 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
23 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED
24 STATES" as follows:

25 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—

1 with respect to various locations, strike out “\$75,650,000”
2 and insert in place thereof “\$94,197,000”.

3 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
4 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
5 amounts “\$742,873,000”, “\$405,061,000”, and “\$1,360,-
6 934,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$811,342,000”,
7 “\$423,608,000”, and “\$1,447,950,000”, respectively.

8 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
9 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
10 read as follows:

11 “(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
12 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
13 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
14 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
15 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
16 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
17 in the next military construction authorization Act would
18 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
19 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
20 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
21 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
22 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
23 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
24 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the
25 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon

1 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
2 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
3 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.”

4 TITLE IV

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
7 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
8 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
9 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
10 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.

11 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
12 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
13 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.

14 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
15 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
16 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.

17 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
18 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
19 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
20 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

21 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such
22 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
23 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
24 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

25 (1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$128,-

821,000; outside the United States, \$46,502,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; section 103, \$5,000,000; or a total of \$323,325,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$281,337,000; outside the United States, \$81,272,000; section 202, \$67,490,000; section 203, \$5,000,000; or a total of \$435,099,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$509,286,000; outside the United States, \$228,628,000; section 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$802,914,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller

1 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
2 quately auditing those contracts; the President may
3 exempt those contracts from the requirements of that
4 section.

5 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
6 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
7 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
8 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
9 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
10 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
11 551).

12 SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of a military department
13 may acquire any interest in land that—

14 (1) he or his designee determines is needed in the
15 interest of national defense; and

16 (2) does not cost more than \$25,000 (exclusive
17 of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency
18 judgments).

19 This section does not authorize the acquisition, as part of the
20 same project, of two or more contiguous parcels of land that
21 together cost more than \$25,000.

22 (b) Section 406 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70
23 Stat. 991, 1015) is hereby repealed.

24 SEC. 407. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
25 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary

1 of a military department in connection with the establish-
2 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
3 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
4 contained in Acts approved before August 8, 1953, and
5 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
6 tion are repealed, except—

7 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
8 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
9 titles that contain the general provisions;

10 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
11 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
12 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
13 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

14 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
15 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
16 contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-
17 second Congress;

18 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
19 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
20 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
21 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

22 (5) the authorization for the development of the
23 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
24 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
25 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress; and

1 (6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
2 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
3 the authorization for (a) development of classified fa-
4 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
5 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
6 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified
7 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
8 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
9 (66 Stat. 606, 609).

10 SEC. 408. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69
11 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read
12 as follows:

13 “SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
14 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
15 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
16 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
17 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
18 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
19 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
20 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
21 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
22 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
23 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
24 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-

1 appropriations available for maintenance and operation but
2 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.”

3 SEC. 409. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
4 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-
5 ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor
6 area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774,
7 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

8 (b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68
9 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

10 SEC. 410. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
11 follows:

12 (a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following
13 new subsection at the end thereof:

14 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
15 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
16 the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
17 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

18 (b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following
19 new subsection at the end thereof:

20 “(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
21 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members
22 of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
23 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

1 (c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following
2 new subsection at the end thereof:

3 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
4 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
5 the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net
6 floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

7 SEC. 411. Section 419 of the Act of August 3, 1956
8 (70 Stat. 991, 1018) is amended to read as follows:

9 “SEC. 419. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this
10 Act or of any other provision of law except a provision of
11 law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, no con-
12 tract shall be entered into by the United States for the con-
13 struction or acquisition of family housing units under title IV
14 of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, by or for
15 the use of military or civilian personnel of any of the military
16 services unless—

17 “(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to
18 the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of
19 the House of Representatives a written report stating
20 the intent to construct or acquire such units, certifying
21 that the number of units to be constructed or acquired is
22 consistent with the long range troop strength to be sta-
23 tioned at the location of such units, and showing the
24 location, number, and estimated cost of such housing
25 units, and the existing housing at such location; and

1 “(2) a fifteen-day period has elapsed since the
2 submission of such report.”

3 SEC. 412. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
4 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
5 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

6 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
7 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
8 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
9 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
10 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
11 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
12 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
13 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
14 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
15 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
16 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
17 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
18 acquisition.”

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

MAY 2, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 19, 1957

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
7 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
8 tion, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following
9 projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
\$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,-
000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,-
000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
\$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,-
530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

1 Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:
2 Land acquisition, \$40,000.

3 Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,
4 and utilities, \$110,000.

5 Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,
6 and land acquisition, \$95,000.

7 (Chemical Corps)

8 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-
10 000.

11 (Signal Corps)

12 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

13 (Corps of Engineers)

14 Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-
15 search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

16 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training
17 facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

18 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
19 000.

20 (Transportation Corps)

21 Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
22 \$1,169,000.

23 Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
24 facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
14 utilities, \$4,859,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,703,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

1 (Fifth Army Area)

2 Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

3 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

4 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance
5 facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

6 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing,
7 \$4,663,000.

8 (Sixth Army Area)

9 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance
10 facilities, administrative facilities, community facility,
11 and utilities, \$1,487,000.

12 Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance
13 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,231,000.

14 (Military Academy)

15 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
16 York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

17 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

18 Various installations: Operational facility, community
19 facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

20 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

21 Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance fa-
22 cilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community
23 facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities,
24 \$8,466,000.

1 (OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

2 (Alaskan Area)

3 Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely,
4 Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical instal-
5 lations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-
6 istrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

7 (Pacific Command Area)

8 Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities,
9 \$154,000.

10 (Caribbean Command Area)

11 Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and
12 utilities, \$273,000.

13 Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

14 (United States Army, Europe)

15 Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage fa-
16 cilities, \$20,754,000.

17 (Army Forces Far East)

18 Various installations: Operational facilities, training facil-
19 ities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing,
20 community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facili-
21 ties, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

22 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or
23 develop classified military installations and facilities by ac-
24 quiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
5 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
6 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
7 military tactical installations for assignment as public
8 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
9 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
10 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
11 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
12 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
13 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
14 structed with appropriated funds.

15 SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
16 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
17 STATES" in section 101, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
19 TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,
20 Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,212,000".

22 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$44,003,000” and “\$133,671,000” and
3 inserting in place thereof “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,-
4 000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
6 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
7 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

8 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
9 TIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Department of the
10 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
11 land, strike out “\$2,360,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$3,137,000”.

13 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
14 (Military Academy)” with respect to United States Military
15 Academy, New York, strike out “\$9,950,000” and insert
16 in place thereof “\$11,983,000”.

17 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts “\$129,096,000” and “\$236,060,000”
20 and inserting in place thereof “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,-
21 870,000”, respectively.

1 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
2 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
3 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

4 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
5 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

6 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,
7 Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place
8 thereof "\$2,039,000".

9 (2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
10 York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$212,000".

12 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
13 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee,
14 Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof
15 "\$9,874,000".

16 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
17 TIES (Chemical Corps)"—

18 (1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,
19 strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof
20 "\$525,000".

21 (2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,
22 Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place
23 thereof "\$1,491,000".

24 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
25 TIES (Transportation Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,240,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,072,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Medical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof "\$876,000".

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Washington, strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof "\$669,000".

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Maryland, strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof "\$800,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, South Carolina, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,400,000".

1 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
2 (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
3 strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof
4 "\$14,283,000".

5 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (Fifth Army Area)"—

7 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
8 out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,-
9 000".

10 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
11 strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$9,893,000".

13 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
14 out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

15 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
16 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect
17 to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert
18 in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
21 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "Alaskan Area"—with respect to
23 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$559,000".

25 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and
3 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$240,220,-
4 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$549,287,000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress
6 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
7 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

8 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
9 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

10 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
11 York, strike out “\$88,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$136,000”.

13 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
14 strike out “\$6,159,000” and insert in place thereof
15 “\$8,593,000”.

16 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
17 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—

18 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
19 out “\$832,000” and insert in place thereof “\$984,000”.

20 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
21 Texas, strike out “\$1,285,000” and insert in place
22 thereof “\$1,847,000”.

23 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES”—

24 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
25 “\$5,301,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,293,000”.

(2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
“\$4,173,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,798,000”.

3 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
4 strike out “\$1,092,000” and insert in place thereof
5 “\$1,373,000”.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,783,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000".

9 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
10 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
11 tion 402 the amounts “\$86,916,000”, “\$200,783,000”, and
12 “\$323,462,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$95,010,-
13 000”, “\$203,331,000”, and “\$334,104,000”, respectively.

14 TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

21 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

23 Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis,
24 Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

1 Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock
2 \$25,438,000.

3 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
4 \$1,452,000.

5 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland:
6 Utilities, \$115,000.

7 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
8 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$4,660,000.

9 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
10 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

11 Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,-
12 998,000.

13 Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
14 facilities, \$391,000.

15 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

16 Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,
17 \$1,326,000.

18 Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
19 facilities, \$544,000.

20 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
21 community facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

22 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
23 \$7,808,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, \$566,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,067,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
2 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
3 \$7,751,000.

4 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Califor-
5 nia: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
6 \$39,000.

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:
8 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

9 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:
10 Operational facilities, messhall, and land acquisition,
11 \$4,774,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-
13 ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

14 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
15 Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,
16 and utilities, \$5,728,000.

17 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
18 facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational
20 facilities, (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

21 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
22 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

23 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
24 tional facilities, \$384,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
2 cilities, \$3,401,000.

3 Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
4 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

5 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
6 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

7 Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and
8 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
9 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
11 tional facilities, (aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,
13 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
14 utilities, \$9,448,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Op-
16 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

17 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

18 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
19 Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
20 istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

21 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
22 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
23 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$6,503,000.

1 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-
2 tional facilities, \$3,620,000.

3 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California:
4 Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

5 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
6 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

7 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

8 Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsyl-
9 vania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-
11 tional facilities, \$2,209,000.

12 Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:
13 Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San
14 Nicolas Island), \$3,479,000.

15 Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field (location
16 to be determined) : Land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

17 SUPPLY FACILITIES

18 Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Admin-
19 istrative facilities, \$92,000.

20 Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Penn-
21 sylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

22 Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ad-
23 ministrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,001,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,256,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utilities, \$316,000.

1 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
2 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

3 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
4 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

5 Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
6 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

7 Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Mary-
8 land: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

9 Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance
10 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

11 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

12 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory
13 foundations, \$1,602,000.

14 Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, South Carolina:
15 Troop housing, \$1,225,000.

16 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training
17 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

18 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training
19 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,375,000.

20 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

21 Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-
22 ational facilities, \$443,000.

23 Naval Communication Station, Newport, Rhode Island:
24 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

1 Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:
2 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

3 Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Op-
4 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

5 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Op-
6 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

7 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

8 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
9 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

10 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

11 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
12 000.

13 Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
14 244,000.

15 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,
16 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
17 \$759,000.

18 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

19 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

20 Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
21 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
22 076,000.

23 Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
24 Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and
25 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

1 Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
2 Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
3 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

4 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

5 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
6 munity facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

7 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
8 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administration facilities and
9 utilities, \$332,000.

10 Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,-
11 699,000.

12 Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
13 000.

14 AVIATION FACILITIES

15 Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
16 erational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,-
17 000.

18 Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and
19 community facilities, \$1,793,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
21 Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),
22 \$2,088,000.

23 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-
24 lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational
2 facilities, \$5,730,000.

3 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
4 tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

5 Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
6 facilities (Tactical air navigation facilities), \$69,000.

7 Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
8 Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),
9 \$69,000.

10 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facili-
11 ties at White Beach, \$504,000.

12 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Oper-
13 ational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-
14 ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

15 SUPPLY FACILITIES

16 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
17 \$1,550,000.

18 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
19 facilities, \$884,000.

20 Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
21 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000

22 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

23 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
24 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
25 \$904,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$898,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities, \$69,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, southern Japan: Operational facilities, housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$726,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$1,093,000.

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent

1 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
2 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
3 total amount of \$65,091,000.

4 SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
5 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-
6 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

7 Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES",
8 with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000"
9 and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

10 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
11 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-
12 397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

13 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of
15 section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,-
16 000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in
17 place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and
18 "\$266,927,000".

19 SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
20 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
21 UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with
23 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Cali-
24 fornia, strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof
25 "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station,

1 El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in
 2 place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the Naval
 3 Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and
 4 insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-
 7 358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

8 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 9 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
 10 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-
 11 807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,-
 12 555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

13 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 14 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
 15 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

16 (1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,
 17 with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Cali-
 18 fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof
 19 “\$1,099,000”.

20 (2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
 21 with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out
 22 “\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.

23 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 24 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
 25 Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out “\$3,686,-

1 000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with
2 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia,
3 Louisiana, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place
4 thereof "\$26,871,000".

5 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
6 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
7 Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000"
8 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
9 the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
10 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
11 and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,
12 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
13 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

14 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
15 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
16 Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,-
17 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

18 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
19 with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,
20 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
21 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval
22 Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out
23 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

24 (7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
25 TIES" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian

1 Head, Maryland, strike out “\$780,000” and insert in place
2 thereof “\$879,000”.

3 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
5 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

6 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”
7 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajelein, Marshall
8 Islands, strike out “\$4,411,000” and insert in place thereof
9 “\$5,235,000”.

10 (2) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATION FACILI-
11 TIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
12 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out “\$2,848,600” and
13 insert in place thereof “\$3,198,600”.

14 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
15 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 “\$151,-
16 342,400” and inserting in place thereof “\$152,763,400”.

17 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts “\$299,512,600”, “\$107,191,300”,
20 “\$151,342,400”, and “\$564,046,300” and inserting re-
21 spectively in place thereof “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”,
22 “\$152,763,400”, and “\$575,592,300”.

23 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
24 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
25 STATES” in section 201, as follows:

1 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
2 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-
3 lina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof
4 "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
5 Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in
6 place thereof "\$8,169,000".

7 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
8 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
9 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
10 623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
11 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$3,340,000".

13 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
14 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
15 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000"
16 and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

17 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
18 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
19 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
20 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

21 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
22 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
23 land, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$10,919,000".

25 (6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-

1 TIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
2 San Francisco, California, strike out "\$2,029,000" and in-
3 sert in place thereof "\$3,779,000".

4 (7) Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
5 TIES", with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
6 Virginia, strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof
7 "\$500,000".

8 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
9 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES"
10 in section 201, as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES",
12 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
13 out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

14 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
15 amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and
16 inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

17 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
18 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
19 amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000",
20 and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place
21 thereof "\$303,453,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000",
22 and "\$451,393,000".

23 TITLE III

24 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
25 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-

1 ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
2 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
3 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
4 ing projects:

5 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

6 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

7 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
9 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
10 \$4,499,000.

11 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Op-
12 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
13 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

14 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facili-
15 ties, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and
16 land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

17 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family
20 housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
21 provements, \$2,048,000.

22 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
23 Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
24 cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community
25 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

1 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
4 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

5 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
6 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

8 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
9 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
10 ground improvements, \$429,000.

11 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
13 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$905,000.

15 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
16 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
17 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
18 \$1,299,000.

19 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
21 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

22 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
23 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

24 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
3 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
4 ments, \$6,804,000.

5 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
6 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

8 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
9 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
10 and ground improvements, \$2,074,000.

11 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-
12 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
13 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
14 improvements, \$2,082,000.

15 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land ac-
16 quisition, \$136,000.

17 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
19 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
20 \$4,328,000.

21 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
22 Community facilities, \$244,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
24 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
25 ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

1 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
2 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
3 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

4 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

6 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply
7 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
8 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

9 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
10 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
11 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

12 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
13 utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real
14 estate improvements, \$1,128,000.

15 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

18 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
20 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
21 and ground improvements, \$2,909,000.

22 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
23 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$358,000.

25 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
2 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
3 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
4 sition, \$48,178,000.

5 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

6 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
7 housing, \$405,000.

8 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
10 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
11 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
12 and land acquisition, \$10,659,000.

13 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
14 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

15 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
16 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
17 \$899,000.

18 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
19 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

20 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
24 ments, \$5,133,000.

1 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:

2 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

3 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational

4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,

5 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground

6 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

7 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:

8 Community facilities, \$56,000.

9 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:

10 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop

11 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

12 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:

13 Operational and training facilities, research, development,

14 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,

15 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,

16 \$2,077,000.

17 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

18 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research

19 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community

20 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land

21 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-

24 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test

1 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
2 provements, \$1,987,000.

3 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
4 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
5 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
6 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

7 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
8 Community facilities, \$206,000.

9 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
10 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
11 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

12 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
15 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
16 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

17 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
18 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
19 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
20 improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,962,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
23 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
24 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
25 and land acquisition, \$4,785,000.

1 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

3 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
5 \$489,000.

6 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
7 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

8 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
9 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
10 ties, \$2,209,000.

11 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
12 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
13 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

14 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
17 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

18 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

21 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
23 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

24 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
25 facilities, \$436,000.

1 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

3 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

6 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
8 \$5,909,000.

9 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Utilities and
10 ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate
11 improvements, \$653,000.

12 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
15 \$4,200,000.

16 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
17 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

18 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
20 \$1,977,000.

21 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements,
24 \$4,118,000.

25 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-

1 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$865,000.

3 AIR UNIVERSITY

4 Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land
5 acquisition, \$50,000.

6 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

7 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical
8 facilities, \$952,000.

9 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

11 Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-
12 ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
13 \$337,000.

14 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

15 Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,
16 Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

17 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
18 Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

19 Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-
20 lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$2,216,000.

22 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$2,089,000.

25 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

1 Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements.
2 and land acquisition, \$496,000.

3 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

4 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
5 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
6 facilities, \$848,000.

7 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
10 \$3,344,000.

11 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
13 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

15 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
16 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
17 facilities, \$1,487,000.

18 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$5,557,000.

21 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
22 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
23 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
24 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

25 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$9,584,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground
9 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
10 ments, \$2,976,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

24 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
25 and training facilities, \$250,000.

1 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
2 acquisition, \$37,000.

3 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

6 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
8 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

9 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
11 ground improvements, \$936,000.

12 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
13 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

15 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

17 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
18 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

20 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

24 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:

1 Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$231,000.

3 Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-
4 shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

6 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
8 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
9 \$3,892,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,528,000.

14 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

17 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

21 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
22 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$1,901,000.

25 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-

1 ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$235,000.

3 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

4 Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance
5 nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
6 munity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
7 acquisition, \$2,149,000.

8 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
9 Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community
10 munity facilities, \$1,287,000.

11 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop
12 housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,-
13 558,000.

14 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
15 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
16 \$760,000.

17 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply
18 facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

19 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

21 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
22 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
23 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
24 \$1,204,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
2 facilities, \$745,000.

3 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
6 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
7 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,558,000.

8 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
9 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

10 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$2,035,000.

12 SPECIAL FACILITIES

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 \$229,000.

15 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

23 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
24 ties, \$430,000.

25 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training

1 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$4,742,000.

3 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
4 \$350,000.

5 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

6 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
7 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
8 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
9 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisi-
10 tion, \$11,500,000.

11 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

12 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
13 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

14 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

15 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
16 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

17 FAR EAST AIR FORCES

18 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational
19 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
20 ties, \$2,642,000.

21 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
22 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$12,738,000.

1 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
4 utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

5 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

6 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities,
7 \$820,000.

8 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
9 training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground
10 improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$59,613,000.

15 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
20 improvements, \$39,217,000.

21 SPECIAL FACILITIES

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 \$170,000.

1 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
4 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-
5 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
6 \$70,000,000.

7 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish
8 or develop classified military installations and facilities by
9 acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-
10 stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land
11 acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and
12 equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

13 SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
14 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
15 UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

16 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with
17 respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, Cali-
18 fornia, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof
19 "\$584,000".

20 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—
21 with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Okla-
22 homa, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof

1 “\$12,686,000”; and strike out “\$1,463,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$2,756,000”.

3 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
4 MAND”—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
5 stead, New York, strike out “\$729,000” and insert in place
6 thereof “\$929,000”; and strike out “\$686,000” and insert
7 in place thereof “\$886,000”.

8 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
9 COMMAND”—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
10 Muroc, California, strike out “\$27,478,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$29,442,000”; and strike out “\$16,192,000”
12 and insert in place thereof “\$18,156,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
15 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
16 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
17 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

18 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

21 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

22 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
23 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

25 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-

kota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$9,220,000";

(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000 and in-
sert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike
out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,-
000";

(5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-
nard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in
place thereof "\$2,935,000";

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,
Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and
insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-
port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and in-
sert in place thereof "\$893,000";

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,
Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place
thereof "\$2,676,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,
Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert
in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,

1 New York, strike out “\$15,803,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$16,654,000”;

3 (3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,
4 Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and
5 insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;

6 (4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force
7 Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.

9 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

10 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
11 Houston, Texas, strike out “\$3,438,000” and insert
12 in place thereof “\$3,876,000”;

13 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
14 San Angelo, Texas, strike out “\$4,081,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$5,088,000”;

16 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
17 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out “\$500,000 and insert
18 in place thereof “\$545,000”;

19 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
20 Harlingen, Texas, strike out “\$446,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$529,000”;

22 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
23 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out “\$883,000” and insert
24 in place thereof “\$1,129,000”;

25 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,

1 Sacramento, California, strike out “\$1,516,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$1,998,000”;

3 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
4 bock, Texas, strike out “\$1,076,000” and insert in
5 place thereof “\$1,304,000”;

6 (8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base,
7 Chandler, Arizona, strike out “\$1,215,000” and insert
8 in place thereof “\$1,556,000”.

9 Under the subheading “HEADQUARTERS COMMAND”—
10 with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, Dis-
11 trict of Columbia, strike out “\$520,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$825,000”.

13 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
14 COMMAND”—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force
15 Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada,
16 strike out “\$555,500” and insert in place thereof “\$624,-
17 500”.

18 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

19 (1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort
20 Worth, Texas, strike out “\$5,929,000” and insert in
21 place thereof “\$7,363,000”.

22 (2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor,
23 Maine, strike out “\$11,155,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$12,218,000”;

25 (3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fair-

1 field, California, strike out “\$9,769,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$11,473,000”;

3 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
4 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
5 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

6 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

7 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base.
8 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
9 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

10 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
11 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$611,000”;

13 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
14 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
15 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

16 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
17 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

19 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
20 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

22 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
23 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
24 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

25 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—

1 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

3 Under the subheading “AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL
4 AIDS”—with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,-
5 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

6 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
8 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
9 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$824,-
10 300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”, re-
11 spectively.

12 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
13 is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED
14 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

15 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

16 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
17 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert in
18 place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

19 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
20 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

22 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
23 gow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert in
24 place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

25 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,

1 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
2 and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

3 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
4 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-
5 sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;

6 (6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
7 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;

9 (7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
10 port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;

12 (8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
13 North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in
14 place thereof “\$27,035,000”;

15 (9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
16 port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”
17 and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;

18 (10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
19 Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-
20 sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;

21 (11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
22 Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert
23 in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;

24 (12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-

consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,726,000”;

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out “\$3,278,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,808,000”;

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out “\$21,510,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,201,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out “\$17,966,000” and insert in place thereof “\$22,005,000”;

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out “\$473,000” and insert in place thereof “\$745,000”;

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof “\$251,000”;

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out “\$5,990,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,763,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out “\$17,121,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,471,000”;

1 (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,
2 Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place
3 thereof "\$22,000";

4 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
5 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and
6 insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

7 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
8 Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$3,063,000";

10 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
11 Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place
12 thereof "\$1,064,000".

13 Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY"—with respect
14 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
15 out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

16 Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
17 MAND"—

18 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
19 ville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert
20 in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

21 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
22 etta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place
23 thereof, "\$500,000".

24 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
25 COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out “\$6,939,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,530,000”;

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out “\$5,488,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,220,000”.

Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out “\$922,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,190,000”;

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out “\$2,179,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,643,000”;

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out “\$14,518,000” and insert in place thereof “\$15,322,000”;

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out “\$943,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,075,000”;

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out “\$1,694,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,966,000”;

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

(7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out “\$1,236,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,586,000”;

(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$2,064,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,607,000”;

(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out “\$5,697,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,155,000”;

(10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, strike out “\$1,491,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,027,000”;

(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$661,000” and insert in place thereof “\$720,000”;

(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out “\$2,791,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,181,000”.

Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out “\$2,613,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,785,000”.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES” as follows:

1 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—
2 with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
5 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
6 amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,-
7 934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000",
8 "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

9 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
10 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
11 read as follows:

12 "(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
13 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
14 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
15 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
16 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
17 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
18 in the next military construction authorization Act would
19 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
20 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
21 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
22 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
23 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
24 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee,
25 shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the

1 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon
2 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
3 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
4 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.”

5 TITLE IV

6 GENERAL PROVISIONS

7 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
8 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
9 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
10 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
11 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.
12 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
13 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
14 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.
15 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
16 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
17 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.
18 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
19 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
20 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
21 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

22 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such
23 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
24 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
25 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$120,099,000; outside the United States, \$34,613,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$297,714,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$260,377,000; outside the United States, \$65,627,000; section 202, \$65,091,000; or a total of \$391,095,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$437,357,000; outside the United States, \$225,407,000; section 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$727,764,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller

1 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
2 quately auditing those contracts;
3 the President may exempt those contracts from the require-
4 ments of that section.

5 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
6 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
7 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
8 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
9 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
10 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
11 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall
12 report semiannually to the Armed Services Committees of
13 the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to
14 all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to
15 the lowest responsible bidder.

16 SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
17 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary
18 of a military department in connection with the establish-
19 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
20 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
21 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and
22 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
23 tion are repealed, except—

24 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-

priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified

1 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
2 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
3 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ; and

4 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
5 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
6 of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47) , as amended.

7 SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69
8 Stat. 324, 352) , as amended, is further amended to read
9 as follows:

10 "SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
11 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
12 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
13 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
14 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
15 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
16 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
17 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
18 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
19 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
20 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
21 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
22 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
23 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

24 SEC. 408. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
25 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-

ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

1 SEC. 410. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
2 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
3 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

4 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
5 Credit Corporation; from appropriations otherwise available
6 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
7 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
8 for civilian personnel; amounts equal to the quarters allow-
9 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
10 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
11 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
12 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
13 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
14 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
15 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
16 acquisition.”

17 SEC. 411. Prior to the termination of, or reduction in
18 the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity
19 being conducted on the date of enactment of this Act within
20 any of the forty-eight States or the District of Columbia
21 (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such
22 termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the
23 supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished by
24 other than civilian employees of the United States; and
25 where such activity has been conducted for five or more

1 years and requires the services of ten or more civilian em-
2 ployees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the Presi-
3 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
4 sentatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed
5 termination or reduction. Such proposed termination or
6 reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of sixty
7 days of continuous session of the Congress following the
8 filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during
9 such sixty days either House of the Congress has adopted
10 a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed
11 termination or reduction described in such report. For the
12 purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be con-
13 sidered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the
14 computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded
15 the days on which either House is not in session because of
16 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

17 SEC. 412. The authority granted by section 2304 (a)
18 (1), title 10, United States Code, shall not be exercised
19 during the national emergency declared by the President on
20 December 16, 1950, except with respect to—

21 (1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of
22 which does not involve more than \$2,500; . . .

23 (2) purchases or contracts for nonperishable sub-
24 sistence supplies;

25 (3) purchases or contracts for property or services

1 for experimental, developmental, or research work, or
2 making or furnishing property for experiment, test,
3 development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000.

4 (4) when in furtherance of small business, labor
5 surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency
6 head determines that supplies or services are to be pro-
7 cured from small business concerns, from concerns which
8 will perform the contracts substantially within labor
9 surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor,
10 or from concerns which will perform the contracts sub-
11 stantially within areas of major disaster.

12 SEC. 413. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
13 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the
14 Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August
15 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing
16 shall be available for the construction of family housing at
17 any installations for which family housing is authorized to
18 be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

19 SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
20 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out
21 in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and insert-
22 ing in place thereof the figure "\$147,341,000".

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

JUNE 19, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 26, 1957.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 8240]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 8, strike "\$4,660,000" and insert "\$1,500,000".

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

The figure \$4,660,000 represents the amount requested by the Department of the Navy for facilities to remedy ground subsidence at the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif. Through error, this amount was permitted to remain in the clean bill although the special subcommittee which studied this problem recommended, and the full committee agreed, to the provision of only \$1,500,000. The general subject matter of this request and its reduction is dealt with under the heading "Title II—Navy Brief of Authorizations."

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States.

TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS GRANTED

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):	
Inside continental United States.....	\$120, 099, 000
Outside continental United States.....	34, 613, 000
Classified.....	143, 002, 000
Total.....	297, 714, 000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside continental United States.....	260, 377, 000
Outside continental United States.....	65, 627, 000
Classified.....	65, 091, 000
Total.....	391, 095, 000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside continental United States.....	437, 357, 000
Outside continental United States.....	225, 407, 000
Classified.....	65, 000, 000
Total.....	727, 764, 000
Grand total.....	1, 416, 573, 000

INCREASES IN PRIOR AUTHORIZATIONS FOR TITLES I, II, AND III

In addition to the authorities enumerated above, the bill, through amendments of prior military construction acts, grants additional authority to the Army in title I in the amount of \$28,885,000.

Similarly, in the Navy title of the bill (II), additional authority, through amendments of prior military construction acts, is granted in the amount of \$42,648,000.

In the case of the Air Force (III), the amendments to prior laws total \$114,962,000.

The grand total of all authorities granted by titles I, II, and III, therefore, are \$1,603,072,000. The original bill requested authority in the amount of \$1,742,394,000. This represents a reduction of the authorities in the Army, Navy, and Air Force titles of \$139,322,000. These increases in prior authority are dealt with in detail later in this report. Suffice it to say at this time that none of these increases represents an enlarged scope of any item with the single exception of the authority granted by the committee for a larger hospital at Fort Jackson, S. C.

From the table set out below, it will be seen that the Budget has approved an appropriation of \$1,900 million for the three military departments. This will provide sufficient money for all the construction items set out in this bill and provide funds also for some prior-year authorizations.

STATUS OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

In order that the House may review the status of all military construction authorization through fiscal years 1948 to date, the following summary is provided:

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total authorizations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1957.....	\$4,065	\$3,333	\$10,882	\$18,280
Less authorization rescinded by sec. 204, Public Law 534, 82d Cong.....	0	-17	0	-17
Less authorization rescinded by title VI, Public Law 209, 83d Cong.....	-271	-78	-399	-748
Less authorization rescinded by sec. 302 (b), Public Law 534, 83d Cong.....	0	0	-37	-37
Less authorization repealed by sec. 511, Public Law 161, 84th Cong.....	-297	-190	-484	-971
Less estimated authorization to be repealed by sec. 410, Public Law 968, 84th Cong.....	-61	-45	-200	-306
Less total appropriations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1957.....	-3,048	-2,745	-8,239	-14,032
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1957.....	388	258	1,523	2,169
Additional new authorization proposed by fiscal year 1958 bill.....	+298	+391	+727	+1,416
Increases in prior years authorizations proposed by fiscal year 1958 bill.....	+28	+43	+115	+181
Total of fiscal year 1957 residual and proposed fiscal year 1958 authorizations.....	714	692	2,365	3,771
Less estimated authorization to be repealed by sec. 406 of fiscal year 1958 bill.....	-8	-10	-50	-68
Less estimated authorization available for rescission as reported under provisions of sec. 403 (b), Public Law 564, 81st Cong.....	-10	0	0	-10
Less proposed fiscal year 1958 appropriation.....	-362	-297	-1,153	-1,900
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1958.....	334	341	1,162	1,793

The foregoing tabulation illustrates that the amount of residual authorization available to the three military departments is being steadily reduced each fiscal year. This means that each year the lowest priority projects are eliminated through the annual rescission of unfunded authorization over 5 years old. (Sec. 406 of this year's bill will change the 5 years to 4 years and thereby speed up the process of rescission.) Consequently, the balance of residual authorization left available is steadily being reviewed, and consists of both urgently needed projects, and other projects for which the requirement has changed due to revisions in missions and weapons. The military departments are each using part of their annual construction appropriations to assure continued progress on the most urgent of these residual projects. The balance of their annual appropriation is applied to essential new authorizations. It is necessary that a proper balance and control be maintained between these two segments of the program, so that construction can satisfactorily proceed on both residual and new authorization, at a rate which is in proper relationship to the funds the Defense Department can make available for military construction. In order to achieve this, the amount of new authorization granted this year has been closely limited and consists mainly of additional increments on projects already underway, items required to support new weapons developments, and essential modernization of our bases. It is intended to fund and utilize all of this new authorization during fiscal year 1958.

TITLE I—ARMY

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):

Inside continental United States-----	\$120, 099, 000
Outside continental United States-----	34, 613, 000
Classified-----	143, 002, 000

Total-----	297, 714, 000
------------	---------------

The Army would be authorized \$297,714,000 in this bill exclusive of the authorities contained in sections 104, 105, 106, 107 and 108. The new authorization granted herein is approximately \$25.8 million less than that authorized the fiscal year 1957.

A general resume of major components included in the new authorization total follows:

(a) The sum of \$44.8 million, or 15.0 percent of the total request for construction of troop and family housing. This authorization will provide 13,504 permanent enlisted men spaces with supporting mess, administration and supply facilities, and 2,449 semipermanent spaces; 360 permanent spaces for bachelor officers, and 122 semipermanent spaces in temporary areas; and 415 units of family housing. (In this connection no new dollar authority is contained herein for the 415 sets of family quarters. The committee notes that sufficient unused prior authorization for family housing is available, and accordingly has added sec. 413 to title IV of the bill to permit reprogramming of prior authorization to meet these requirements.)

(b) The sum of \$115.0 million or 38.6 percent of the total request for construction of facilities for the tactical defense of key cities, bases and industrial centers in the continental United States. Also \$8.5 million, or 2.8 percent of the total for construction of facilities in close support of tactical installations defending the continental United States.

(c) The sum of \$20.8 million, or 7.0 percent for construction in support of Army aviation at 17 permanent Army installations.

(d) The sum of \$10.8 million or 3.6 percent of the total request for facilities necessary for the furtherance of the Army's research and development program.

(e) The sum of \$20.8 million, or 7.0 percent of the total for continuance of construction of the France line of communications. Also the sum of \$9.0 million, or 3.0 percent of the total for further improvements to troop living conditions in Korea.

(f) The balance of the program, \$68.0 million or 22.8 percent, for other essential construction of facilities including \$28.0 million for other classified facilities, both in continental United States and temporary base rights areas overseas, necessary to the accomplishment of the Army's missions, worldwide.

A breakdown of the program by broad categories is as follows:

Program by categories

[In thousands]

Category	Continental United States	Overscas	Total
1. Operational and training facilities.....	\$16, 310	\$1, 319	\$17, 629
2. Maintenance and production facilities.....	23, 270	1, 576	24, 846
3. R. and D. and test facilities.....	10, 849	-----	10, 849
4. Supply facilities.....	2, 058	20, 754	22, 812
5. Hospital and medical facilities.....	3, 827	154	3, 981
6. Administrative facilities.....	1, 689	248	1, 937
7. Housing and community facilities.....	45, 132	9, 562	54, 694
8. Utilities and ground improvements.....	16, 138	1, 000	17, 138
9. Real estate.....	826	-----	826
Total.....	120, 099	34, 613	154, 712
Classified.....	125, 750	17, 252	143, 002
Grand total.....	245, 849	51, 865	297, 714

A description of the program by major activities and the missions to be served, follows:

Technical services

Ordnance Corps.—The assigned mission of the Ordnance Corps under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to support Army combat forces by the provision of all weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, ordnance general supplies and trained personnel to furnish specialized ordnance services, of the types needed, when and where needed. This element of the program totals \$21,970,000 for construction at six installations, to include operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, representing 7.4 percent of the program.

Quartermaster Corps.—The Quartermaster General under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, develops, provides and services food, clothing, petroleum (except field and higher echelon maintenance of pipelines), aerial supply equipment, other quartermaster equipment, supplies, maintenance and services for the Army, and, as assigned, for the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; provides for the disposal of Army surplus personal property, as assigned; and provides for the care and disposition of the remains and personal effects of deceased personnel of the Army and as directed or agreed upon, of the Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and for general supervision of the operation of national cemeteries. Included in the program for the Quartermaster Corps is \$7,533,000 for construction at 6 installations to include operational facilities, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, representing 2.5 percent of the program.

Chemical Corps.—The mission of the Army Chemical Corps, under the direction and control of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, is to provide support to the Department of Defense (Army, Air Force, and Navy including the Marine Corps) in the fields of chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare, including smoke, flame, and incendiaries, and materiel and equipment. This mission carries with it a responsibility to assure that the Army achieves a realistic capability for operations in both offensive and defensive CBR warfare.

This segment of the program totals \$681,000 for the construction of troop housing and utilities at 2 installations, representing 0.2 percent of the program.

Signal Corps.—The primary mission of the Signal Corps under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics is to provide communication and pictorial services for the United States Army Establishment, worldwide, and for other components of the Department of Defense as directed. The Signal Corps element of the program totals \$1,936,000 for construction of troop housing at one installation, representing 0.6 percent of the program.

Corps of Engineers.—The Corps of Engineers, a technical service and a combatant arm, is the construction agency for the Department of the Army whose Chief reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. The Chief of Engineers is the commander of the Corps of Engineers and the senior engineer staff officer of the Department of the Army, and as such is in charge of the entire military-civil work of the Corps of Engineers. Construction proposed for the Corps of Engineers totals \$4,915,000 for construction at three installations, to provide operational facilities, a training facility, a maintenance facility, utilities and a research and development facility, representing 1.6 percent of the program.

Transportation Corps.—The Transportation Corps, a technical service under the direction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, provides or secures transportation services for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This element of the program totals \$5,116,000 for construction at four installations to provide operational facilities, troop housing, a medical facility, an administrative facility and utilities, representing 1.7 percent of the total program.

Medical Corps.—The Army Medical Service, headed by the Surgeon General who reports to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, furnishes the Army Establishment, and when appropriate, members of other uniformed services, medical and dental care, hospitalization, evacuation, preventive medicine, veterinary and other services essential to the maintenance of health. This program will provide \$2,857,000 for construction at two Medical Corps installations, for troop housing and utilities, representing 1 percent of the total program.

Continental United States Armies

First United States Army.—The mission of the Commanding General, First United States Army, a Continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont is to: command the 14 installations and 6 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to the 24 additional installations and 4 subinstallations commanded by the Chief of an Administrative Service or Technical Service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Antiaircraft Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support and recruiting of the Reserve components which includes United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)

and within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within First Army Area. The program includes \$5,162,000 for construction at 2 installations in the First Army Area, to provide operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, representing 1.7 percent of the program.

Second United States Army.—The mission of the Commanding General, Second United States Army, a continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia is to: command the 14 installations and 2 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to the 47 additional installations and 5 subinstallations commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Antiaircraft Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support and recruiting of the Reserve components which includes United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training and matters of mutual interest within Second Army Area.

This element of the program contains \$7,830,000 for construction at 4 installations, to provide operational facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, an administrative facility, troop housing, community facilities and utilities, representing 2.6 percent of the program.

Third United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Third United States Army, a Continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee is to command the 9 installations and 1 subinstallation within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to the 18 additional installations commanded by the Chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Antiaircraft Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components which includes United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)

and within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Third Army Area. The program includes \$17,145,000 in support of Third United States Army at 5 installations, to provide operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, ground improvements and utilities, representing 5.8 percent of the program.

Fourth United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Fourth United States Army, a continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas is to command the eight installations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to the 17 additional installations and 1 subinstallation commanded by the chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Antiaircraft Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components which includes United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training, and matters of mutual interest within Fourth Army Area. There is included in the program \$18,475,000 in support of Fourth Army for operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, a medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, land acquisition and utilities, representing 6.2 percent of the total program. This sum and percentage include an item of \$675,000 for the acquisition of an office building at the entrance gate of Fort Sam Houston, Tex. The committee inserted this item on the conviction that the building could be well utilized for headquarters and other administrative functions, was ideally located for these activities, and represented good business for the United States from the standpoint of cost.

Fifth United States Army.—The mission of the commanding general, Fifth United States Army, a Continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming is to command the 16 installations and 1 subinstallation within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to the 41 additional installations and 7 subinstallations commanded by the Chief of an administrative service

or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Antiaircraft Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components which includes United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officers Training Corp (ROTC) and within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training and matters of mutual interest within Fifth Army Area. The Fifth Army element of the program totals \$8,573,000 for construction at 4 installations, to provide an operational facility, a maintenance facility, troop housing, and utilities, representing 2.9 percent of the total program.

Sixth United States Army.—The mission of the Commanding General, Sixth United States Army, a Continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, is to command the 15 installations and 10 subinstallations within the Army area, including responsibility for operations, security, training, administration, and logistical support of the active Army units and activities assigned or attached to the Army; furnish limited administrative and logistical support to the 28 additional installations commanded by the Chief of an administrative service or technical service of the Department of the Army; provide for administrative and logistical support to units of the Army Antiaircraft Command; be responsible for organization, administration, training, logistical support, and recruiting of the Reserve components which includes United States Army Reserve, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and within limitations, National Guard; prepare plans for and conduct operations in internal security, military assistance to civilian authorities during emergencies, ground defense, mobilization, and other specific missions as directed; such as maintaining designated units of the strategic reserve for rapid deployment; be responsible for joint actions with Air Force and Navy relative to recruiting, induction, operations, training and matters of mutual interest within Sixth Army area. The program provides \$6,718,000 at 2 installations in the Sixth Army area, for operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, a community facility and utilities, representing 2.3 percent of the total program.

Other continental United States areas

The United States Military Academy, West Point, has the mission of instructing and training the Corps of Cadets, so that each graduate shall have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Regular Army. The Army's program contains \$1,666,000 for construction of utilities at the Academy, representing 0.6 percent of the total program.

Armed Forces special weapons project.—The Armed Forces special weapons project is an agency of the Secretary of Defense and of the three military departments. Its mission is to furnish support to the

departments in the field of atomic weapons by providing technical, logistical, and training services. The AFSWP responsibilities include all national stockpile sites: Sandia Base at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; a field command at Sandia Base and the project headquarters. Construction in the amount of \$1,056,000 is included in the program, or 0.4 percent at 6 installations to provide an operational facility, community facilities, and utilities.

Tactical installation support.—These facilities provide the close logistical support for tactical defense installations in the continental United States. This element of the program totals \$8,466,000 at various installations, or 2.8 percent of the program, to provide an operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities.

Overseas permanent and general areas

Alaskan area.—The Alaska Command provides the ground and antiaircraft defense and logistic support of military bases in Alaska and operates the Army Arctic Test Center. The program includes \$4,143,000, or 1.4 percent, for the construction of an administrative facility, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing and utilities at 5 permanent installations and various tactical sites.

Pacific Command area.—The program includes \$154,000 for construction of medical facilities at one installation, or 0.1 percent of the total.

Caribbean Command area.—The mission of the command is to provide ground and air defense of the Panama Canal; to operate the United States Army Caribbean School for Latin American and United States military personnel, and to provide logistical support for military bases in the Panama-Puerto Rico area. The program for this command totals \$562,000 or 0.2 percent of the program for construction of community facilities and utilities at 2 installations.

United States Army, Europe.—This element of the program totals \$20,754,000 for continuance of construction of the line of communications, France. The mission of the LOC is to provide logistical support for the combat forces of the United States Army stationed in Germany. The construction is for various installations and represents 7.0 percent of the total program.

Army Forces, Far East.—The program includes \$9 million or 3 percent of the program for further improvements to troop living and operating conditions in Korea. The mission of the United States Army in Korea is to command all United States Army Forces assigned or attached in Korea and to exercise operational control over United Nations, Republic of Korea, and such other ground forces as may be provided by the commander in chief, United Nations Command. To provide logistical support for such United Nations or Republic of Korea forces or agencies as may be directed and to be prepared to militarily support United States interests in preservation of the independence of the Republic of Korea as such action may be directed by the Commander in Chief, Far East Command.

Section 102

This section includes \$143,002,000 or 48 percent of the program for the establishment and development of classified Army installations, worldwide.

Section 103

This is a new provision, not heretofore requested by the Army. The authority will permit the Department of the Army to purchase out of appropriations available for military construction, family housing, including land acquisition, at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents. The provision limits the number of units that may be acquired by the Army to 300 sets of quarters, and stipulates that housing so acquired shall be subject to existing statutory cost and space limitations. The committee acknowledges that this authorization is permissive in nature, and accordingly no dollar authorization has been granted. The committee also understands that the Army will not resort to condemnation proceedings in the acquisition of such housing, except where necessary to clear the title.

Sections 104, 105, 106, and 107

These sections provide amendments to Public Laws 209 and 534 of the 83d Congress, and Public Laws 161 and 968 of the 84th Congress, increasing authorizations granted in these laws at certain installations. These amendments are necessary to defray deficiencies in authorization granted in fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1957, brought about basically by the general rise in construction cost indexes throughout the world.

CONCLUSIONS

The committee concludes that the Army's program is a sound, well-balanced program, developed under austere considerations, and is consistent with the Nation's economy. The program includes only the minimum, most urgently needed construction to carry out the Army's missions throughout the world.

The committee notes that the Army has made most commendable progress in minimizing requests for the acquisition of new lands. Aside from land required for antiaircraft Nike installations in the continental United States, there are only 2 land acquisition projects included, for a total of 8 acres to be acquired in fee title at a cost of \$41,500.

TITLE II—NAVY

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title II (Navy):

Inside the United States.....	\$260, 377, 000
Outside the United States.....	65, 627, 000
Classified.....	65, 091, 000
Total.....	391, 095, 000

The Navy would be authorized in this bill \$391,095,000 for new public works and an increase in prior authorization of \$42,648,000 to compensate for increases in cost to construct certain public works which had been authorized in previous years. The Navy's program is an integral part of a long-range plan to modernize its Shore Establishment in keeping with the modernization of its operating forces which has been underway since World War II.

The bill would authorize only one new activity for the Navy. This is the naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, at a location to be

determined later, probably somewhere in the triangular area of Maryland between Washington, Baltimore, and Annapolis. It would be used for indoctrination of midshipmen from the Naval Academy and also for the aviation functions now performed at the naval air station, Anacostia, D. C. The authorization would be for acquisition of land at an estimated cost of \$3,200,000. This would be the first increment of the facility which has been recommended for a number of years by the Board of Visitors. It had been authorized last year by the House bill but was excluded from the authorization act finally passed by the Congress to allow the Navy to make further site studies. The establishment of Towers Field will produce a dividend by making available the facilities of the naval air station, Anacostia, for use by the naval receiving station, thus avoiding an immediate expenditure of an estimated \$20 million for a new receiving station. The receiving station, now located adjacent to the air station, must be relocated to make room for the Anacostia Freeway, a highway that is now under construction. If the present naval air station is to be used as the naval receiving station, the Navy estimates the long-range cost for barracks and other facilities will be \$15 million.

Approximately 84 percent, or \$328.9 million of the Navy's program is for piers, runways, shops, and other operational facilities. Twelve percent, or \$46.6 million is for barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, messes, dispensaries, and other personnel support facilities; about 3 percent, or \$9.9 million is for laboratories and similar research and development facilities; and the remaining 1 percent of the Navy's program, or \$5.7 million is for acquisition of fee and easement interests in land.

The Navy presented what the committee considered to be a "tight" program, requesting authorization of public works projects totaling \$435,099,000. The committee studied the program thoroughly and interrogated Navy representatives closely. One of the projects considered, Subsidence Remedial Measures, Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif., was passed over temporarily because the committee felt unsure that it is required immediately. To dispel this uncertainty, the chairman appointed a subcommittee to make an immediate on-site investigation. The subcommittee visited the shipyard, held an open hearing at which the various interested organizations and individuals were given an opportunity to air their views, returned to Washington and reported to the full committee. It is the considered opinion of the committee that this project should be restored to the bill, but only in the amount of \$1,500,000. The Navy informed the subcommittee that this amount would provide for the immediately required minimum construction, a dike, which would protect the Government property from inundation. The committee believes that the Federal Government should take no further action until the local community and those profiting from the extraction of oil have given concrete evidence that they are doing all reasonably possible to correct the subsidence problem.

The Navy's program approved by the committee consists of the following 10 classes of facilities:

1. Shipyard facilities, \$77,144,000

Shipyard facilities line items are required to support the improved types of ships which are now joining the fleet, to protect the existing installations including two shipyards, to provide certain classified

operational facilities for our fleet commanders, to provide urgently needed barracks, hospitals, and community facilities for our personnel in the Philippines and to improve the capabilities of our laboratories in research and development.

This class of facilities is composed of 34 line items at 13 activities. One of the major items is the first increment of construction of a drydock at the Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash., to accommodate the *Forrestal* class carriers for major repairs. When it is completed, this will be the only United States drydock in which battle damage to these large carriers can be efficiently and economically repaired. Other projects in this group will correct deficiencies in facilities at 7 continental installations; will provide for the minimum construction, the building of a dike, to protect the naval shipyard at Long Beach, Calif., from flooding by the ocean as a result of ground subsidence; will provide for reconstruction of a deteriorated wharf and construction of crane tracks around a drydock at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard; will provide for another increment in the development of naval base and naval station at Subic Bay in the Philippines; and will provide certain facilities to the commanders in chief of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets essential to their operations.

2. *Fleet base facilities, \$19,216,000*

It is the purpose of the fleet facilities program to insure adequate shore-based support, peculiar to no single element of the operating forces, but general in scope and completely responsive to broad requirements of composite elements of the fleet. Such facilities must be so located as to insure support on a timely and efficient basis in order to maximize the combat effectiveness of limited combat forces.

There are 13 line items at the 8 activities in this group. Six of the items are for support of personnel at continental and overseas stations and include barracks, bachelor officers' quarters, enlisted men's recreation facilities, family housing, and additional station hospital facilities. The family housing and hospital improvements are for the isolated naval station, Adak, Alaska. The remaining items are for utilities improvements at 2 continental and 2 overseas stations; additional headquarters facilities for the commander in chief, Pacific, made necessary by the recent consolidation of responsibilities in the area; and ship mooring and berthing facilities at 2 continental stations.

3. *Aviation facilities, \$178,566,000*

The aviation shore activities are necessary for training new naval aviators, for supporting the Operating Forces of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, and for research and development in the aeronautical field. The projects in the bill under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Aeronautics are designed to enable the Naval Aeronautical Shore Establishment to more nearly attain its mission and to improve the safety of operations as illustrated by the extension of runways, installations of optical landing systems, and TACAN installations.

Aviation facilities comprise nearly half of the Navy's program, dollarwise. This class includes 135 line items at 47 air stations. There are several "package" programs in this group. The first of these at a total cost of \$3,189,000 is to provide an "optical landing system" at 18 continental and 5 overseas air stations to reduce pilot error in landing fast jet aircraft. The second program will provide a

"TACAN"—tactical air navigation facility—at 10 continental and 2 overseas stations. This is another safety system, an electronic directional facility which will provide for improved navigation of aircraft. The total cost of these facilities is estimated at \$528,000. The third package will provide guided-missile support facilities at 4 continental and 2 overseas air stations at a cost of \$1,719,000. The final aviation package program will provide for extension of one runway at each of 11 continental and 3 overseas air stations to a length equivalent to 10,000 feet at sea level. It includes a corresponding increase in taxiway length and runway and taxiway lighting. The Navy requires the longer runways for safe landing of fast jet aircraft and safe recovery after abortive takeoffs of loaded aircraft. At 8 of the 14 stations acquisition of land will be required for the runway extensions and end zones and relocation of public or private utilities, railroads, roads, or drainage ditches. The total estimated cost of this package is \$67,904,000.

The aviation facilities are composed of five groups of air stations. The first group consists of 18 line items at 8 naval air training stations. The program will provide for the second increment in the development of two new air advanced training stations at Meridian, Miss., and New Iberia, La. It also provides for dredging and construction of a pier at Pensacola to accommodate an *Essex* class, angled-deck carrier to be used in carrier qualification training procedures. Deficiencies in facilities will be corrected at the other stations.

The second group are the fleet support air stations, made up of 60 line items at 19 stations. Included are second increments for development of a master jet field at Lemoore, Calif., a seaplane facility at Harvey Point, N. C., and an auxiliary field used in training in guided-missile operation at San Clemente Island, about 80 miles west of San Diego, off the coast of California. The other projects are for relatively minor buildup of existing stations in line with technological advancements.

The third group consists of 21 line items at 5 Marine Corps air stations. It includes another increment for development of the Beaufort, S. C., station for accommodation of the Third Marine Air Group. It will also provide for modernization of the other four stations, including land for developing the Mojave Station under the new concept to minimize future encroachments.

The fourth group of 4 special-purpose air stations includes 7 line items for continued buildup of these existing stations and the first increment—the acquisition of land for the naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, mentioned previously.

The final aviation facilities group are 29 line items at 11 existing overseas stations. The major project in this group will provide the second increment of facilities for the development of the naval air station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R. Although the runways have been in use for the annual fleet exercises, the other station facilities, including some transferred from the Army, of World War II vintage, have been inactive for a number of years. This station is being used for guided-missile training of the Operating Forces of the Navy in the Atlantic Fleet. The other projects will continue the development of the Navy's strategic overseas bases. The second and final project in this year's program for family housing is included for the naval station at Argentia, Newfoundland.

4. Supply facilities, \$5,329,000

The mission and purpose of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts shore facilities is to provide direct supply support to the fleet throughout the world. Supply centers and depots replenish combatant ships and mobile support ships wherever deployed, as well as furnishing supply support to naval installations, such as shipyards, air stations, training centers, etc. Navy material stocks, repair parts, and consumable supplies are controlled by inventory control points which are also a part of the Bureau's shore facilities.

This group of projects will provide for electronic data processing facilities at 3 continental supply offices; the second and final increment of petroleum storage replacement facilities at Adak; a commissary store at Guam; and the second increment for development of the supply depot at Subic Bay, Philippine Islands, consisting of 5 line items.

5. Marine Corps facilities, \$21,725,000

The Marine Corps is subject to call on short notice to deploy its forces, ranging in size from a few men to a division, to any part of the world, for guard duty, to quell a disturbance, or to participate in full-scale war. Consequently the Marines must be highly trained in amphibious and other means of warfare, and competently led. Constant training is necessary to attain and retain proficiency.

This group of projects consists of 37 line items at 8 continental Marine Corps activities. Facilities will be provided for maintenance of Marine equipment, for support of personnel and for personnel training.

6. Ordnance facilities, \$36,070,000

The objective of the military construction program of the Bureau of Ordnance is to provide and keep modern facilities ashore for effective support of the fleet. Recent introduction of new weapons into the fleet has generated requirements for new support facilities. In turn, these new support facilities are already placing greater demand on our stations for electric power, steam and water. Additionally, there are urgent requirements to replace or modernize overage facilities.

This construction program provides for the above three classes of requirements. Over 75 percent of the program provides for new facilities to support new weapons.

There are 57 line items at 14 Ordnance activities in this group. At 5 of the activities important development work on guided missiles will be conducted. At the other Ordnance activities facilities will be provided for storage and processing of guided missiles and other types of ammunition.

7. Service school facilities, \$13,800,000

The Chief of Naval Personnel's program is part of an integrated continuing plan designed to provide a balance between the new weapons system and the demand for high degree of personnel training and stability in view of limited manpower resources. The program includes facilities to meet new training requirements, and for the improvement of morale and stability of personnel through the provision of better living accommodations and adequate recreational facilities.

There are 6 line items at 4 continental stations in this group of projects. The projects are for personnel training facilities and barracks and bachelor officers' quarters. The first increment for extension of Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy, long recommended by the Board of Visitors, is included. It will provide for the construction of the foundations and the plans for later construction of the superstructures of the additional wings to Bancroft Hall. The 3,600 midshipmen at the Academy are now crowded into space designed to accommodate only 2,500. The project, when completed, will relieve this intolerable condition.

8. Communication facilities, \$24,244,000

The mission of naval communications is to:

(a) Provide required reliable, secure, rapid communications primarily for control of the operating forces, and secondarily to facilitate the administration of the Naval Establishment.

(b) Perform classified operations required of the Navy by the National Security Agency and the Chief of Naval Operations.

The 20 line items at the 12 stations in this group are needed primarily to modernize the Navy's communication system in keeping with the tremendous technical advances in communication equipment which offer increased speed and reliability with an attendant reduction in manpower. One continental and one overseas project will permit the Navy to fulfill, in part, its responsibility to provide a link in the Department of Defense communication "scatter system." This system is nearly 100 percent reliable, a very important asset in the northern areas where it will operate and where long and frequent "blackouts" are not uncommon with conventional equipment.

9. Office of Naval Research, \$9,180,000

Public works sponsored by the Office of Naval Research are for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for conducting scientific research and development in the fields of nuclear physics and radio astronomy.

There are only 2 line items at 2 continental locations in this group. The first line item will provide for an additional floor on the three-story laboratory building at the Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia. This will provide much needed space to further research in the nuclear field. The other facility is to be constructed at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

10. Yards and docks facilities, \$5,821,000

The Bureau of Yards and Docks shore activities are required for several purposes: (a) To receive, store, and ship construction materials and advanced base components for current and mobilization overseas construction; (b) for the operations and maintenance of facilities at major naval complexes; and (c) supervision of construction of the overall Navy, and, as required, Air Force, public works program.

This group of facilities will provide for 7 line items at 5 locations. Four of the line items will provide improvements to existing utilities systems. A fifth line item will provide for a utilities shop at the public works center at Subic Bay in the Philippines. The remaining two line items are for electronic data processing facilities and a provisions cold storage plant at the naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif.

The committee also approved a number of amendments to prior authorizations of public works. It considered that the various factors contributing to higher costs in today's construction market warrant the requested increases in authorization. The amount approved totals \$42,648,000.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATION

Title III (Air Force):

Inside continental United States.....	\$437, 357, 000
Outside continental United States.....	225, 407, 000
Classified.....	65, 000, 000
Total.....	727, 764, 000

The Air Force would be authorized \$727,764,000 in this bill to provide for the construction of new facilities at 187 major installations, of which 123 are inside the United States and 64 are in oversea areas. The bill also provides facilities at a number of other installations and sites including operational sites for strategic defense and tactical missiles, off-base navigation aids, aircraft control and warning system sites, and facilities at classified locations. In addition, the bill provides an increase of \$114,962,000 in authorization in prior years' laws to cover the increased costs on certain approved projects.

The Air Force installations program of the last several years has been aimed at providing airbase facilities required for the 137-wing Air Force that in 1953 was approved as the Air Force goal. This original goal of 137 combat wings by June 1957 now has been modified by a thorough review of the Air Force task and today's more modern and more powerful equipment and weapons. By the end of fiscal year 1958, the Air Force proposes to reduce the force to 128 wings, with further reductions in subsequent years indicated dependent upon the extent to which new weapons and equipments are proven and can provide adequate defensive and offensive capability with reduced numbers of force units. The fiscal year 1958 military construction program of the Air Force includes the minimum facilities required to provide an operational capability to the forces planned at end fiscal year 1960.

Breakdown of the Air Force authorization request is contained in the following tables:

	Authorization amount	Percent of total
<i>Thousands</i>		
Inside the United States:		
Strategic Air Command.....	\$163,435	22.5
Air Defense Command.....	107,657	14.8
Air Training Command.....	45,581	6.3
Air Materiel Command.....	48,432	6.6
Tactical Air Command.....	26,213	3.6
Air Research and Development Command.....	23,876	3.3
Aircraft control and warning system.....	7,331	1.0
Air Proving Ground Command.....	6,784	.9
Military Air Transport Service.....	6,341	.9
Continental Air Command.....	1,428	.2
Air University.....	50	.1-
Special facilities.....	229	.1-
Inside United States, total.....	437,357	60.1
Outside the United States:		
Aircraft control and warning system.....	70,000	9.6
Strategic Air Command.....	64,216	8.8
USAF, Europe.....	39,217	5.4
Far East Air Forces.....	15,380	2.1
Alaskan Air Command.....	18,652	2.6
Military Air Transport Service.....	15,006	2.1
Caribbean Air Command.....	1,400	.2
Air Materiel Command.....	1,366	.2
Special facilities.....	170	.1-
Outside United States, total.....	225,407	31.0
Sec. 302: Classified facilities.....	65,000	8.9
Worldwide total.....	727,764	100.0

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide for the air defense of the continental United States.

This program amounts to \$107,657,000 and provides operating facilities at 28 locations.

Included within the total are \$13,793,000 to provide facilities in support of Strategic Air Command heavy and medium bomber squadrons at 3 locations; \$244,000 to provide support facilities for a strategic missile squadron at 1 location; \$42,963,000 to provide facilities for 4 air defense missile squadrons; \$5,215,000 for the acquisition of necessary real estate to provide Air Defense Command ammunition storage facilities in support of various fighter-interceptor squadrons.

The remainder of the Air Defense Command program provides facilities required to support the basic mission.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

The mission of this command is to (1) provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance and supply for the United States Air Force; (2) provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies for the United States Air Force; (3) train specialized units for the accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and (4) train individuals requiring a long training lead time to fill requirements of air depot type units scheduled for activation and to fill replacement requirements. This program amounts to \$48,432,000 and provides facilities at 12 locations.

Included within AMC total program there are facilities to modernize the AMC depots totaling \$5,542,000, and \$23,584,000 for facilities to accommodate SAC dispersal missions at 2 locations. Also included in the AMC program are \$1,636,000 for facilities for research and development at 2 locations, and \$1,331,000 for facilities for Air Defense fighter-interceptor squadrons at 2 bases. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic AMC mission requirement.

AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

The mission of this command is to (1) perform employment suitability testing of aircraft, guided missiles, navigational aids, components, and material; (2) develop techniques and procedures in the use and operation of aircraft, guided missiles, armament, and components applicable to Air Force purposes. This program amounts to \$6,784,000 consisting of an electronic test range, radar communications test range, guided-missile electronic test range, armament research test range, quarters for officers and nurses, base chapel, storm drainage disposal, and necessary acquisition of land to support off-base instrumentation sites.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

The mission of this command is to attain and maintain qualitative superiority by the following procedures: (1) Conduct or supervise scientific and technical studies required for the accomplishment of Air Force missions; (2) seek new basic knowledge from which improved aeronautical equipment, material, weapons and techniques can be developed; (3) undertake the development and recommend the adoption of appropriate new and improved devices and systems for the conduct and support of air warfare, including aircraft, missiles, weapons, techniques, and procedures applicable to Air Force purposes. This program amounts to \$23,876,000 and provides facilities at 6 major installations and 5 auxiliary installations.

Included within the Air Research and Development Command total program are technical facilities for research, development, and testing totaling \$11,387,000 and facilities for Air Defense fighter-interceptor squadrons at 2 bases totaling \$4,815,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic ARDC mission requirement.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; air-crew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training, and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program amounts to \$45,581,000 for Air Training Command and provides facilities at 19 locations.

\$16,287,000 provides for base support facilities for Air Training Command and modernization of the USAF pilot training program at three locations and expansion of the combat crew training capability at 2 locations; \$9,833,000 for the expansion of the runways for flying training at three bases and 2 auxiliaries; \$10,689,000 for facilities to accommodate the SAC dispersal mission at 3 locations; \$8,649,000 for facilities for Air Defense Command fighter-interceptor redeployment

at 3 new locations; and \$123,000 for facilities for an ADC fighter interceptor mission at 1 base.

AIR UNIVERSITY

The mission of this command is to prepare officers for command of large Air Force units, wings, groups, and squadrons, and for staff duties appropriate to those command positions and to provide education to meet the scientific requirements of the Air Force. This program amounting to \$50,000 provides for acquisition of a runway clearance easement at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of this command is to discharge within the continental United States and field responsibilities of the Chief of Staff, USAF, with respect to:

The Reserve Forces for the Department of the Air Force that are assigned to the Continental Air Command, including supervision and inspection of the Air National Guard of the United States.

Domestic emergencies.

Miscellaneous administrative functions.

In the event of war or other emergency, mobilize the units and/or individuals of the Air Force Reserve that are assigned to the Continental Air Command.

Discharge within the continental United States such other responsibilities as the Chief of Staff, USAF, may direct.

The program amounts to \$1,428,000 and provides facilities at 3 locations.

\$952,000 provide for an altitude building required by the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base. The remaining \$476,000 support the basic mission of the command.

There are no facilities included in this program in support of the Reserve forces mission. Reserve Force facilities are being provided under the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

The mission of this command is to provide (1) airlift required in support of approved joint war plans; (2) scheduled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States; between the continental United States and overseas areas, and between and within overseas areas as directed by higher authority; (3) worldwide air transport, air weather, airways and air communications and air rescue service systems; (4) flight service within the Zone of Interior; (5) organization and training of air resupply and communications services; (6) supervision and control and maintenance of primary facilities required for performing its assigned mission; (7) theater jurisdiction in overseas areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander. This program amounts to \$6,341,000 for Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at 5 locations.

Included within the Military Air Transport Service total program are facilities for Air Defense fighter-interceptor missions at 3 bases,

amounting to \$3,773,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic MATS mission requirement.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program amounts to \$163,435,000 and provides facilities at 40 locations.

Included in the Strategic Air Command program are \$64,561,000 to provide facilities required at 4 new dispersal bases and additional facilities necessary at 5 dispersal bases included in prior programs; \$18,093,000 provides additional facilities at 10 heavy bomber home bases. These additional home base requirements are necessitated primarily by conversion from B-36 to B-52 aircraft; \$21,207,000 are included for facilities necessary to accommodate redeployment of medium bombers at 2 bases.

Eight million ninety-six thousand dollars will provide required facilities for Air Defense missions at 10 Strategic Air Command bases; \$13,417,000 accommodates redeployment of Air Defense interceptor-fighter missions at 3 bases. The remainder of the Strategic Air Command program, amounting to \$38,061,000 will provide for items required to support the basic mission throughout the entire command.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide for Air Force support of land, naval, and/or amphibious forces and operational training of Air Force units therefor. This program contains \$26,213,000 and provides facilities at 11 locations.

Included within this program are \$12,761,000 to correct deficiencies in operational and base support facilities; \$8,510,000 for facilities to accommodate a SAC dispersal mission at 1 location; and \$4,942,000 for facilities for ADC fighter-interceptor missions at 3 bases.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

This section provides \$229,000 for classified facilities at 2 locations

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

The aircraft control and warning system is the ground environment portion of the air defense system. The function of this system is to detect and identify all airborne objects, evaluate the threat, commit and control weapons such as manned interceptors and missiles for the destruction of enemy targets.

The aircraft control and warning portion of the program totals \$7,331,000 which provides operations building additions, receivers and transmitters, troop housing and messing facilities, additional water supply, utilities, multipurpose recreational facilities, and acquisition of necessary real estate at various aircraft control and warning installations.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Alaskan Air Command is to organize and conduct the air defense of Alaska and provide early warning to the United States and Canada. This command supports the Strategic Air Command, Military Air Transport Services, COMALSEAFRON, the United States Army, and the northwest route to the Orient. This program amounts to \$18,652,000 for the Alaska Air Command and provides facilities at four bases and 2 various locations.

Included within the Alaskan Air Command total program there are facilities to support modification of 10 existing radar towers totaling \$3,350,000; facilities for a classified operational site for \$8 million; and operational, technical, and maintenance facilities costing \$2,924,000 required to support F-102 type aircraft. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic Alaskan Air Command mission.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance, and supply for the United States Air Force; provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies of the United States Air Force; train specialized units for the accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and train individuals to fill requirements of newly activated air depot units and replacement requests. This program amounts to \$1,366,000 and provides facilities at 3 overseas locations. These facilities consist of dependent schools at all 3 locations, and operational facilities for a fighter-interceptor mission at 1 location.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of this command is to provide supervision, guidance, and administrative control of the USAF missions in Latin America; provide supervision, guidance and administrative control of the Air Force phase of the mutual defense assistance program (MDAP) for Latin American countries; conduct a USAF school for Latin America; provide logistic support for air attachés and USAF missions in Latin America; provide airlift within Latin America for the Inter-American Geodetic Survey Team and provide administrative control of the United States Air Force Section, Joint Brazil-United States Military Commission. The program provides \$1,400,000 for the rehabilitation of the runway at Howard Air Force Base to support the movement of flying activities from Albrook Air Force Base where the airfield is incapable of expansion.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

The mission of this command is to conduct tactical operations, the air defense of Japan, Ryukyus, Marianas, Hawaii, and the United States installations in the Philippines; to provide air transportation for combat troops, other personnel and supplies in the Pacific and Far East areas, and to provide logistic support to FEAF and SAC forces. This program amounts to \$15,380,000 for the Far East Air Forces

and provides facilities at Hickam Air Force Base and at 5 locations in the Far East area.

Included within the Far East Air Forces program are facilities for a mobile radio squadron at one classified location for \$2,673,000; a runway extension for fighter interceptors at 1 location costing \$2 million; and ammunition storage and checkout facilities at 2 locations for \$611,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to meet the basic Far East Air Forces mission requirements.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE (OVERSEAS)

The mission of this command is to provide aircraft required in support of approved joint war plans; scheduled airlifts for the Department of Defense between the continental United States and overseas areas; between and within overseas areas; worldwide air transport; air weather; airways and air communications, air rescue service systems, and organization and training of Air Resupply and Communications Service and all elements thereof. This program includes \$15,006,000 for the Military Air Transport Service and provides facilities at 3 locations in the Atlantic Ocean area.

Included are facilities for rocket storage totaling \$265,000 at one location, an addition to a global communication network building and the construction of a bridge at a second location, costing a total of \$2,268,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support air transport and strategic operations.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program amounts to \$64,216,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at Andersen Air Force Base on Guam, Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, and 14 various locations in foreign countries.

Included within Strategic Air Command program are facilities to support a classified operation totaling \$29 million, and operational-type facilities at 2 locations required for support of fighter-interceptor aircraft totaling \$1,131,000. The remainder of the program is composed of item to support the basic SAC mission requirements.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The mission of this command is to support the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; United States Commander in Chief, Europe, and the other component commanders under USCINCEUR in their assigned missions; to fulfill responsibilities assigned the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or the USCINCEUR's area of responsibility, and to support commanders operating directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program amounts to \$39,217,000 for United States Air Forces in Europe and provides facilities at 39 locations.

Included in the program are facilities to support 3 bases in Spain totaling \$9,214,000; aircraft control and warning activities at 2 locations totaling \$451,000; mobile radio squadrons at 4 locations totaling

\$735,000; 3 locations for ammunition storage, assembly and checkout totaling \$1,059,000; fighter-interceptor aircraft at 1 location totaling \$796,000; a global communications center totaling \$43,000; 3 sites for Mideast operational and logistic support totaling \$6,637,000; facilities at 2 bases totaling \$5,053,000 in support of fighter-bomber operations; medical facilities at 2 locations totaling \$1,513,000 and special weapons training at 1 location costing \$47,000.

The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic USAFE mission requirement.

SPECIAL FACILITIES (OVERSEAS)

This section covers special facilities at various locations totaling \$170,000 for classified projects at 2 locations.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM (OVERSEAS)

This section provides \$70 million for an eastward extension to the distant early warning line.

Ratio of construction in overseas areas.—Prior to fiscal year 1957, the ratio of Air Force construction in the continental United States to construction overseas averaged approximately 60 percent for bases inside United States and 40 percent for overseas locations. In fiscal year 1957 the ratio for continental United States rose to 70 percent, and the overseas portion dropped to 30 percent. The Air Force military construction program for fiscal year 1958 continues the trend started in fiscal year 1957 of minimizing foreign construction.

The "Outside the United States" section of title III of the bill contains an authorization total of \$225,407,000. However, \$153 million of this total is scheduled for the North American Continent, its approaches, and the United States Territories and possessions. Therefore, the Air Force program for foreign establishments is only \$72 million or roughly 10 percent of the total program. This \$72 million is primarily to improve the living conditions of Air Force personnel and to provide facilities for the operation of new weapons at those foreign locations where operational requirements demand continued utilization by United States forces.

Category distribution of Air Force fiscal year 1958 military construction authorizations

	Total (thousands)	Percent of total
Operational and training.....	\$439,616	60.4
Housing and community.....	108,708	14.9
Supply.....	60,921	8.4
Maintenance.....	42,504	5.8
Utilities.....	36,185	5.0
Research, development, and test.....	18,259	2.5
Hospital and medical.....	4,220	.6
Real estate.....	9,246	1.3
Administrative.....	5,001	.7
Real estate improvements.....	3,104	.4
Total.....	727,764	100.0

The emphasis placed by the Air Force upon attainment of operational capability and provision of adequate facilities for its personnel is illustrated by the type of facilities included in the program, with two

categories, operational and training and housing and community, accounting for 75 percent of the total.

The largest category, as in preceding years, is for operational and training facilities. One-third of this category is for airfield pavements, principally for expansion of runways and parking aprons for the B-52 bombers and KC-135 tankers phasing into the SAC bomber units and for jet training aircraft. The balance of the category consists primarily of facilities for strategic, defense, and tactical missile systems, bases for tanker refueling operations, and the aircraft control and warning system.

Included in the housing and community category are troop and family housing, religious and recreational facilities, and community support facilities. In the Air Force, these personnel facilities are given equal stature with operational requirements as an essential factor in the retention of the skilled and technically trained people vital to the effective operation and high state of readiness of the Air Force combat units. Troop housing, the dormitories, bachelor officer quarters, and dining halls, in this category totals \$58,417,000. The religious and recreational facilities portion of the category amounts to approximately \$35 million.

Eighty-five percent of the supply category consists of storage facilities for weapons, including missiles. The balance is devoted primarily to aircraft fuel storage.

Approximately \$35 million of the maintenance category are devoted to aircraft maintenance facilities, principally for SAC units at bases in the United States.

The medical facilities category includes the construction of 2 hospitals, 2 dental clinics, and 1 dispensary.

FORMULATION OF THE PROGRAM

There are set out above what the committee considers all of the basic facts and figures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force construction programs for fiscal year 1958. Bare statistics, however, tell only what the program is. For the kind of understanding which the committee feels it is obligated to convey to the House, it is necessary also to know the how and why.

Review procedure

Every construction program presented to the Congress by the Department of Defense is, in the first instance, based on requirements. There are differences of opinion as to what the requirements are, and it is these differences of opinion and approach that make the program when presented to the Congress the combined thinking of the best military and civilian minds within the Department of Defense.

First step

The first step in the formulation of a military construction program is to obtain from the field offices of the military departments the needs of the individual military establishments within the geographical or other jurisdiction of each of the field offices. These requests are considered, in most instances, by the next echelon, or echelons, of field officers prior to their submission to the Department concerned.

Second step

The next step is consideration within the Department itself. Here again the program goes through several processes of review, until final approval of the Secretary of the military department. Each of the secretaries then submits his recommendations to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations). The Assistant Secretary's Office is a relatively small one, but staffed with experts in military construction and in fields allied to it. Here, with a singleness of purpose that has been most encouraging to the committee, all of the programs are reviewed, coordinated, and assembled into a single program reflecting the overall construction needs of all of the military departments.

Original program

As originally received in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), the service requests for this year's construction program contained in excess of 4,000 line items. As indicated above, these requests had been previously screened by appropriate divisions of the military departments. As a result of this detailed review, many items were eliminated or reduced in scope or cost. The original total dollars requested was in excess of \$3.6 billion. The sum recommended in the present bill is \$1,416,573,000.

Personal equation

The value of any construction program is in direct ratio to the amount of planning, thought, and review that is put into it. These factors, in turn, are dependent for their worth upon the individuals with the responsibility for formulating and reviewing the program. The committee is convinced that there has been great improvement over the past few years in all of these aspects of the formulation of the military construction programs. The Department of Defense and its military departments have, in the opinion of the committee, engendered a confidence in this respect that is now deserved.

Witnesses

Witnesses from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and from each of the military departments, were questioned most closely with respect to the foregoing matters, and the committee received an assurance, which by the end of the hearings it accepted completely, that every item in the bill as presented had received the closest scrutiny and consideration during every step toward its final submission to the Congress.

NEW BASES

The utilization of new weapons and the assignment of new missions requires that certain new bases be provided, and a list of those in continental United States is shown below. In addition to this, other new bases which are necessary to support certain classified activities are also included in this bill. Details on this latter type of new bases can be given during subsequent closed sessions.

Department	Name of new base	Location	Purpose
Army.....	Cold Regions Laboratory...	Hanover, N. H....	Research and development.
Air Force.....	Molette auxiliary field ¹	Orville, Ala.....	Auxiliary field for Craig Air Force Base.
Do.....	Auxiliary field ¹	Meadow, Tex.....	Auxiliary field for Reese Air Force Base.

¹ The 2 Air Force auxiliary fields in this tabulation are for flight training purposes only. Strictly speaking, they are not "bases" as they are not occupied by personnel. A runway and a taxiway are the only construction which they require.

In addition to the foregoing, the committee inserted an authorization for John H. Towers Field. This authorization in the amount of \$3,200,000 is for land acquisition alone. It would be noted from the bill that the location of the field is to be determined and a subcommittee was appointed to study this matter. When it is established, this installation will provide, among other things, a flying facility for the Naval Academy.

REAL ESTATE

The large acquisitions of real estate by the military departments over the past several years has been a matter of concern to members of the committee and to all Members of Congress. For this reason, it is believed that the real-estate holdings of the military departments and the acquisition of property which would be authorized by this bill should be the subject of discussion. The real property under military control includes property owned, leased, used by permit, easement, and various occupancy rights (foreign base agreements). As of June 30, 1956, the military departments controlled approximately 33.6 million acres of land throughout the world. This land, together with the improvements, had an original cost to the United States of \$22.9 billion.

The real estate under military control may be grouped as follows: 27.1 million acres in the United States, together with improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$18.2 billion; 3.9 million acres in the Territories and possessions, together with the improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$2.5 billion; and 2.6 million acres in foreign countries together with the improvements thereon having an original cost of \$2.2 billion.

The real property under military control in the United States consists of the following:

	Acres
Fee-owned.....	7, 415, 936
Public domain.....	14, 978, 035
Temporary use.....	2, 758, 146
Leased.....	1, 866, 496
Easements.....	62, 836
Total.....	27, 081, 449

Attention is invited to the fact that over half of the land under military control is public domain land that has never been on the tax rolls. Only 7,415,936 acres of land under military control have been removed from the tax rolls in the United States.

The 27.1 million acres under military control in the United States is approximately 1.4 percent of the total land area in the United States.

The United States Government owns 409.5 million acres of land

in the United States or 21.5 percent of the total land area in the United States.

The following summary shows the land acquired and disposed of by each military department during the past 10 fiscal years:

	Acquisitions		Disposals	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost ¹
Army:				
Fee and lesser.....	650,665	\$39,256,171	1,642,467	} ² \$3,335,015,709
Public land.....	2,335,417	2,052,603	5,167,707	
Navy:				
Fee and lesser.....	96,091	42,310,381	95,479	306,160,928
Public land.....	259,600	50,075,257	157,781	24,213
Air Force: ³				
Fee and lesser.....	407,613	80,681,835	540,494	} ⁴ 138,971,735
Public land.....	1,171,944	407,018	877,218	
Subtotal fee and lesser.....	1,154,369	162,248,387	2,278,440	-----
Subtotal public land.....	3,766,961	52,534,878	6,202,706	-----
Total for 3 military departments.....	4,921,330	214,783,265	8,481,146	3,780,172,585

¹ The cost shown for the disposal of property includes the original cost to the Government of the land, together with the improvements made available for disposal in accordance with existing law.

² Includes cost of improvements that were situated on 2,266,938 acres of leased land.

³ Period 1949-56. Army figures include actions taken in behalf of "Air Corps" prior to 1949.

⁴ Includes cost of improvements that were situated on 185,898 acres of leased land.

This shows that large areas of land formerly under military control have been disposed of, and the committee was assured that the Department of Defense is increasing its efforts to dispose of the maximum practical amount of property. The Real Property Management Directorate of the Assistant Secretary (P. and I.) office has established a program which would result in substantial savings through reduction in direct Defense expenditures for management and upkeep of real property not needed, not used, and not presently subject to local taxation or available to meet expansion requirements brought on by reason of growth of the community in which located. A sound base has been established for evaluating the merits of military departments' requests for additional acquisitions; and criteria have been developed for the purpose of assuring joint utilization of the real property under military control whenever such use is feasible from an economic and military approach.

At the same time, the committee is aware that new weapons systems and the new concepts for their use have made it necessary to acquire additional acreage. For example, 50,000 acres would have provided an adequate artillery range 15 years ago; however, the present range requirements for rockets, guided missiles, and similar weapons are now measured in millions of acres. Similarly, the old 5,000-foot runways for propeller-type aircraft have now been extended to 12,000 feet in order to accommodate new jet aircraft. From the foregoing, it is obvious that the military departments will continue in the future to have some additional requirements for land acquisition. Meanwhile, however, continued efforts will be made to dispose of all property for which a need is not foreseen.

The original fiscal year 1958 program submitted from the military departments requested \$92 million for land acquisition. This was reduced to \$22.3 million, the amount requested in S. 1940 and H. R. 7130, as a result of the reviews conducted by the Department of

Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. A summary of the real-estate acquisitions which the bill now contains, as reported by the committee, is shown in the following tabulation (dollar amounts are in thousands):

	Fee acquisition (in acres)	Fee cost	Easement acquisition (in acres)	Easement cost	Total cost
Army	942	\$1,650	1,200	\$310	\$1,960
Navy	29,444	8,231	4,345	645	8,876
Air Force	9,140	5,480	26,336	8,796	14,276
Total	39,215	15,187	30,050	9,452	24,639

Replacement plan

One of the deterrents to the Department's efforts to dispose of real property is the lack of assurance that the necessary replacement property will be obtained. To correct this situation, the Department of Defense is considering a plan for authorizing disposition of high-priced real property and use of part of the proceeds of sale for less expensive replacement property. There are many military installations, originally sited in suburban areas, that are now partially or completely surrounded by urban development. The dollar value of these Government holdings has multiplied; but, simultaneously, the potential use by the military department concerned has been lessened and necessary expansion almost completely prohibited.

Acquisition of substitute property would permit: (1) More advantageous siting on low-cost lands, (2) substantial benefits to both civil and military interests, and (3) reasonable assurance of room for expansion in event of mobilization. If and when such authorization is obtained, it will permit concurrent arrangements to be made for acquisition and disposal.

A plan is also being considered which will permit the sale of nonexcess industrial plants in cases where the production of such plants can be assured by inclusion of the necessary conditions in the instrument of conveyance. This will permit sale of many plants that are now producing end items for the defense program. The production in many of the plants is a small percentage of the total production capacity of such plants. Needless to say, the sale of such plants will make them available for civilian production and return them to the local taxrolls.

INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR LAND

Representations were made to the committee during its hearings that the establishment of amounts to be received by landowners upon acquisition of their property by the United States for defense purposes does not, under current procedures, make the landowners whole. The committee realizes that land involuntarily sold to the United States whether through negotiation or condemnation does create special circumstances and special problems which are not found in the normal free real-estate market. For this reason, a subcommittee was appointed to examine into this matter and make recommendations to the full committee.

INCREASE IN PRIOR YEARS' AUTHORIZATION

Due primarily to the general rise in building costs, the amount previously authorized for certain projects is now insufficient for their completion. For this reason, the increases in prior years' authorization acts which are outlined in titles I, II, and III of this bill are necessary. The total of this deficiency authorization amounts to \$23,489,000 in title I, \$42,605,000 in title II, and \$114,962,000 in title III. Other factors, in addition to the overall rise in construction costs, have also contributed to this situation. These include change from the light airfield pavement previously authorized to the heavier type now required to support heavy bombers at our dispersed fields; unexpected increases in construction costs in Arctic areas where little experience was available on which to accurately base our estimates; and unusual field conditions encountered at some sites.

The three departments admitted that a substantial number of projects for which increased authorization is necessary were poorly planned in the first instance and did not reflect anything but the most general estimates of cost. The committee was assured that since advanced planning authority and funds are now available to the military departments, the cost estimates contained in this bill and the cost estimates for the future will be on a very much sounder basis.

HOUSING

Appropriated fund housing

The bill as submitted to the committee would have authorized the construction of 2,381 family housing units within and outside the United States. The bill as reported by the committee authorizes 2,214 houses (1,440 in the United States and 774 outside the United States). This represents a reduction of 167 houses. The reduction of 139 of these units was made at the request of the military department concerned and does not represent a committee deletion. The 68 units planned for Wendover Air Force Base, Utah, was reduced to 40. This latter reduction was committee action based on a specific study of the housing situation at Wendover Air Force Base. It has been the view of the Armed Services Committee, and is still the view today, that the best and cheapest way to provide our military people with family housing is through the use of direct authorization and appropriation of funds. It is for this reason that the committee would be unlikely to reduce any family units proposed for construction in this fashion where the need was justified by a military department.

Use of prior authorization

It will be noted that the words "family housing" occur throughout the bill. The money figure, however, for the installations which have this wording as part of its descriptive language, does not contain a money amount for the housing units. The committee, during its deliberations on the bill, deleted all sums which related to family housing and is requiring the military departments to utilize existing authority for the construction of these units. Section 413 authorizes the secretaries of the military departments to exercise any outstanding authority for family housing under previous military construction authorization acts (Public Law 765, 83d Cong., Public Law 161, 84th Cong., and Public Law 968, 84th Cong.) to provide family housing at those installations for which family housing is authorized by H. R. 8240. In

other words, to the extent that there remains any of the dollar authorization for family housing originally provided by these acts, such dollar authorization may be used at any installation for which family housing is authorized by the present bill.

Such reprogramming may not, in a number of instances, result in the construction of the same number of houses originally contemplated in the authorizing acts. This may be true because of the increase in cost of construction since the prior authorization; it may also be true, where, for example, authority for family housing in the continental United States is used in Alaska, which is a high-cost area.

All of the family housing to be so reprogrammed under this section will be subject to the permanent net floor area limitations contained in title 10 of the United States Code, as well as to the monetary limitations contained in the applicable appropriation acts.

The authority provided by this new section will not, it should be noted, conflict with the limitations in section 403 of H. R. 8240 since that section deals only with the extent to which line item authorizations in the present bill may be increased, and does not restrict the exercise of previous authority.

Wherry housing

The history of the so-called Wherry housing program is well known and needs no repetition here. It was embarked upon when it appeared that it provided the only feasible method for providing much-needed family housing for our military personnel. It served a useful purpose. It was pointed out in last year's report that in the committee's opinion, the time had come when this unusually expensive program should be reviewed and action taken which would eliminate costs which are wholly unnecessary.

With the foregoing thoughts in mind, the committee inserted in last year's bill a provision which permitted the purchase by the Government of Wherry housing projects. The housing act of last year also contained authority for the purchase of Wherry units.

As the Armed Services Committee pointed out last year, the savings to be effected are so large that it would be an unreasonable man indeed who would deny the wisdom of embarking upon this program of purchase. Briefly stated, a Wherry owner or sponsor holds a lease for 50 or 75 years from the Government which gives him the right to future income for the period of his lease. When one considers that the housing unit involved costs less than \$9,000 to construct, and that the average housing allowance is \$90 a month or \$1,080 a year, it is clear that the Government will spend exorbitant sums prior to the time that it will have possession of the house. For example, the Congress will be appropriating housing allowance at the average rate of \$1,080 per year per unit for either 50 or 75 years. For those leases which cover 50 years, the cost to the Government for the \$9,000 unit will be \$54,000. The cost to the Government for the 75-year lease unit will be \$81,000. There are today approximately 82,000 Wherry units. One needs but to multiply 82,000 times \$54,000 to conclude that prompt and aggressive action of the kind contemplated by this section must be taken.

A few Wherry projects have been acquired. The committee, however, has not been impressed with progress so far. The reasons given for the small number of Wherry acquisitions is that the program presents novel and complex problems not previously faced in the

acquisition of property. The committee is aware that this is the case. However, it believes that all of these problems should have been faced and solved by this time and it expects aggressive action by the three military departments to acquire as many Wherry housing projects as is possible and to do so as quickly as it can be done.

Capehart housing

It would appear that the very great majority of housing for the military departments will be provided under the so-called Capehart housing program. Because of the great importance of family housing to the military services, and notwithstanding the fact that this kind of family housing is not a part of the military construction bill, the committee believes that this report should include a brief summary of the Capehart program as it is today. There is set out below, therefore, a tabulation of 93,796 units (231 projects) of new title VIII (Capehart) housing which has been approved by the Department of Defense as of April 15, 1957.

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Approved by Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations).....	93,796	27,832	21,314	44,650
In process.....	64,915	12,757	20,719	31,439
Being advertised.....	4,547	2,147	0	2,400
Bidder accepted.....	8,068	4,078	160	3,830
Under contract.....	16,266	8,850	435	6,981
Private.....	4,558	1,899	0	2,659
FNMA.....	11,708	6,951	435	4,322
Total cost of units under contract.....	\$245,080,949	\$134,730,972	\$7,183,807	\$103,166,170
Average.....	15,067	15,224	16,515	14,778
Mortgage proceeds.....	235,826,690	129,074,170	6,847,200	99,905,320
Average.....	14,498	14,585	15,741	14,311
Private.....	63,071,115	26,793,515	0	36,277,600
FNMA.....	172,755,575	102,280,655	6,847,200	63,627,720
Appropriated funds.....	9,254,259	5,656,802	336,607	3,260,850
Average.....	569	639	774	467

Of projects presently under contract, average mortgages range from \$12,713 at Blytheville Air Force Base in Arkansas (360 units) to \$16,406 at Fort Lawton, Wash. (66 units). The overall average mortgage for such projects is \$14,498 per unit, as shown above. It will also be seen that an average of \$569 per unit of appropriated funds has been spent for site acquisition and off-site utilities, pursuant to authorization contained in section 505, Public Law 155, 82d Congress. Thus the overall average total cost for units now under contract is \$15,067.

SPECIAL STUDIES

As is usual during the consideration of a military construction bill, there arose the need for special studies of particular items. During the consideration of H. R. 8240 two such studies became necessary; one at Long Beach, Calif., in connection with subsidence of the naval shipyard, and the other relating to family housing at Wendover Air Force Base, Utah. Special subcommittees were appointed to look into each of these matters, and the bill reflects the conclusions and recommendations of those subcommittees as agreed to by the full committee. Both of these items are dealt with elsewhere in this report.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions in this year's bill follow generally the pattern followed in prior military construction acts. There are, however, some differences and these will be pointed out.

Sections 401 through 405

Sections 401 through 405 repeat, with one exception, similar provisions in Public Law 968, 84th Congress, the Military Construction Act for fiscal year 1957. The exception referred to is the second sentence in section 405 which provides that the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the Armed Services Committees with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. The reason for the insertion of this new requirement in the bill is to permit the committees to be advised as to when and why the military departments negotiate construction contracts. It is realized that it is in the construction field that there is least room for criticism because of contracting practices. Over 90 percent of all construction contracts are entered into as a result of competitive bidding. The committee could wish that this pattern obtained in other fields of military procurement. However, so long as there are some negotiated contracts, the committee feels it should be officially advised in detail as to the circumstances surrounding this departure from normal practice.

Section 406

Section 406 as it appeared in the original construction bill continued the general rescission provision which has been contained in recent construction acts. To date, authorities have been rescinded automatically by this type of provision after 5 years. The committee has been concerned over the large gap between authorizations and appropriations and feels that the rescissions of old authority should be dealt with more aggressively. The section this year, therefore, provides that unused authorities which have been in existence 4 years will be automatically rescinded. It is the committee's intention next year, and it has so cautioned the Department of Defense, to lower this 4-year period to 3 years. The device has been found to be extremely effective in lowering the amount of unfunded and unused authorities. The action this year and the contemplated action this year will greatly further this effectiveness.

Section 407

Section 407 would extend the leasing authority for housing at tactical installations for 1 more year and increase that authority from 3,000 units (as provided in Public Law 968, 84th Cong.) to a new total of 5,000 units, so that Nike and antiaircraft gun site housing requirements may be met by utilizing existing private housing to the greatest possible extent, thereby reducing the necessity for construction of military quarters.

Section 408

Section 408 would make the current statutory floor area limitations applicable to all housing authorized for construction with appropriated funds, by repealing the more restrictive limitations which applied to those units authorized under Public Law 765, 83d Congress.

Section 409

Section 409 would permit up to 15 percent of enlisted men's quarters (those with 4 bedrooms) to have total floor area not to exceed 1,250 square feet. The limitations on other units would remain unchanged. The military departments have stated that more than one-sixth of married enlisted men in the upper grades (E-7 through E-4 with 7 or more years' service) have families of the size and composition requiring 4-bedroom units. Experience has demonstrated that an adequate 4-bedroom unit requires at least 1,200 to 1,250 square feet of net floor area.

Section 410

Section 410 would further amend section 407 of Public Law 765, 83d Congress (surplus-commodity program), to assure that housing allotments otherwise paid to or rental charges collected from civilian personnel will be available for payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation when such personnel occupy housing constructed under this program.

Section 411

Section 411 would require that prior to the termination of, or reduction in the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity being conducted on the date of enactment of H. R. 8240 within any of the 48 States or the District of Columbia (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished by other than civilian employees of the United States, and where such activity has been conducted for 5 or more years and requires the services of 10 or more civilian employees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed termination or reduction. The section also provides that any proposed termination or reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of 60 days of continuous session of the Congress following the filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during such 60 days either House of the Congress has adopted a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed termination or reduction described in such report. For the purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

Section 412

The committee continues to be concerned with the large amount of procurement through negotiation and without competitive bids. It, therefore, felt that any step which it could take in the direction of limiting the area of procurement through negotiation would be salutary. Illustrative of the need for limiting the area of negotiation is the fact that from information available to the committee, funds spent by the Department of Defense under the authority of the Korean emergency proclamation of December 16, 1950, constituted 94.19 percent of all Defense Department funds. During a 9-month period in 1956 and notwithstanding corrective action which was supposed to have been taken by the Department of Defense, \$5,312,550,000 was contracted, for using the same emergency proclamation.

This represented 38.94 percent of Department of Defense dollars. It is clear from these figures that corrective action is necessary and the committee submits that the step taken through the insertion of section 412 will rectify this situation at least to a considerable extent.

Section 413

This section grants authority for the military departments to utilize existing family housing authorization to construct the units authorized by this bill. The matter is dealt with in more detail under that portion of the report headed "Housing."

Section 414

As the bill was introduced, title III included an authority in the amount of \$21,341,000 for the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo. The committee felt that since the Air Force Academy had been authorized by a specific act of Congress, Public Law 325, 83d Congress, any increase in authorization for the Academy should be by amendment to that law. The authorization in the amount cited, therefore, was removed from title III and appears as a section 414 in the general provisions.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this proposed legislation will involve the expenditure of \$1,676,622,000. This amount is made up of \$1,416,573,000 which represents the new authority granted in titles I, II, and III, plus \$186,499,000 which represents the increases in prior authorities (deficiency authorizations), plus \$21,341,000 for the Air Force Academy, plus \$52,209,000 as the cost of the family housing which is authorized by this bill.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1958 and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as is evidenced by the letter dated May 1, 1957, from Secretary of Defense C. E. Wilson which is set out below and made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1957.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1957, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would authorize additional military construction that is urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for construction is provided for in the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year 1958.

This legislation consists of titles I, II, and III, covering authorization required by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively; and title IV covering general provisions relating to this legislation.

This proposal would authorize new construction totaling \$1,561,338,000, of which \$323,325,000 is for the Department of the Army; \$435,099,000 is for the Department of the Navy; and \$802,914,000 is for the Department of the Air Force. This proposal would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for projects authorized under previous laws totaling \$181,056,000, of which \$23,489,000 is for the Army; \$42,605,000 is for the Navy; and \$114,962,000 is for the Air Force. Therefore, the total in this proposed legislation of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to \$1,742,394,000.

This proposal would also repeal all authorizations, with certain exceptions, for military construction that are contained in laws enacted after July 14, 1952, but prior to August 8, 1953. This repeal will continue in effect the policy established in the fiscal year 1956 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 161, 84th Cong.) and continued in the fiscal year 1957 act, of repealing long-standing authority that has not been exercised by the military departments. It is believed that the continuation of this policy will result in a construction program which will reflect more accurately the current needs of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the rules of the House of Representatives, there is herewith printed in parallel columns the text of provisions of existing law which would be repealed or amended by the various provisions of the bill.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, Public Law 968, 84th Cong.)

(Sec. 302:)

The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop:

(a) Classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of \$163,000,000.

(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by

(Sec. 306:)

Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to read as follows:

“(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, Public Law 968, 84th Cong.)

(Sec. 410:)

As of July 1, 1957, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts enacted before July 15, 1952, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the

(Sec. 406:)

As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the

EXISTING LAW

titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1957, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. 881 et seq.); and

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$82,000,000, that is contained in title I, section 102 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress.

THE BILL

titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress.

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609).

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), as amended

(Sec. 515:)

During the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than three thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental for such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.

The Act of September 1, 1954
(68 Stat. 1119)

(Sec. 404:)

Not to exceed two hundred and fifty of the units of family quarters constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of this Act shall have a net floor area of not to exceed two thousand and one hundred square feet. None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed by this Act shall have a net floor area in excess of one thousand two hundred and fifty square feet, and the average net floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed one thousand and eighty square feet.

(Sec. 407:)

Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

(Sec. 408:)

(a) Family quarters to be constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

Title 10, United States Code

(See. 409:)

(Sec. 4774. Construction of quarters: limitations on space and cost:)

Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) In the construction of family quarters from appropriated funds for members of the Army, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Square feet</i>
General officer-----	2, 100
Colonel-----	1, 670
Major or lieutenant colonel-----	1, 400
Officer below major-----	1, 250
Enlisted member-----	1, 080

In this section, “net floor area” means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States; and

(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, base, or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position.

(c) The maximum limitations for family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for civilians are the same as those for members of the Army of comparable responsibility, grade, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

(d) Except when built by members of the Army, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Con-

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

gress if the cost is more than \$100,000.

(e) A limitation upon the cost of quarters built for members of the Army does not apply to expenditures for work and equipment outside those quarters, including expenditures for—

(1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal;

(2) roads and walks; and

(3) grading and drainage.

(Sec. 7574. Quarters: limitations on size:)

(a) In the construction of family quarters for members of the naval service, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

(1) For flag officers in the Navy and general officers in the Marine Corps—2,100 square feet.

(2) For Captains in the Navy and colonels in the Marine Corps—1,670 square feet.

(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Navy and lieutenant colonels and majors in the Marine Corps—1,400 square feet.

(4) For officers of the naval service below the grade of lieutenant commander or major—1,250 square feet.

(5) For enlisted members of the naval service—1,080 square feet. In this section "net floor area" means all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States; and

(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station or installation,

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

based on the grade authorized for that position.

(e) The maximum limitations for family quarters for civilians are the same as those for members of the naval service of comparable responsibility, grade, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

(See. 9774. Construction of quarters: limitations on space and cost:)

(a) In the construction of family quarters from appropriated funds for members of the Air Force, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Square feet</i>
General officer.....	2, 100
Colonel.....	1, 670
Major or lieutenant colonel.....	1, 400
Officer below major.....	1, 250
Enlisted member.....	1, 080

In this section, "net floor area" means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States; and

(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, air base, or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position.

(c) The maximum limitations for family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for civilians are the same as those for members of the Air Force of comparable responsibility, grade, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(d) Except when built by members of the Air Force, no permanent barrack, quarters, building, or other permanent structure may

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

be built unless a detailed estimate of its cost has been submitted to Congress and a specific appropriation has been made therefor. No one may build such a structure without specific authority of Congress if the cost is more than \$100,000.

(c) A limitation upon the cost of quarters built for members of the Air Force does not apply to expenditures for work and equipment outside those quarters, including expenditures for—

(1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal;

(2) roads and walks;

(3) grading and drainage; and

(4) the construction of air bases or depots under section 9773 of this title.

The Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 119) as Amended

(Sec. 407:)

In addition to family housing and community facilities otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters, and community facilities, in foreign countries through housing and community facilities projects which utilize foreign currencies to a value not to exceed \$250,000,000 acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(Sec. 410:)

The second paragraph of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

“The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allowances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental charges collected from personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such pay-

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel for the fiscal year 1956 and each succeeding fiscal year, amounts equal to the quarters allowances otherwise payable to personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition.

ments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition."

The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives quarterly reports, the first of which shall be submitted three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the three-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.

TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

CHAPTER 137. PROCUREMENT
GENERALLY

* * * * *

§ 2304. Purchases and contracts:
formal advertising; ex-
ceptions

(a) Purchase of and contracts
for property or services covered

SEC. 412. The authority granted
by section 2304 (a) (1), title 10,
United States Code, shall not be
exercised during the national emer-
gency declared by the President

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

by this chapter shall be made by on December 16, 1950, except formal advertising. However, the with respect to—

head of an agency may negotiate such a purchase or contract, if—

(1) it is determined that such action is necessary in the public interest during a national emergency declared by Congress or the President;

* * * * *

(1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of which does not involve more than \$2,500;

(2) purchases or contracts for nonperishable subsistence supplies;

(3) purchases or contracts for property or services for experimental, developmental, or research work, or making or furnishing property for experiment, test, development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000;

(4) when in furtherance of small business, labor surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency head determines that supplies or services are to be procured from small business concerns, from concerns which will perform the contracts substantially within labor surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor, or from concerns which will perform the contracts substantially within areas of major disaster.

SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$147,341,000".

PUBLIC LAW 325—83D CONGRESS
CHAPTER 127—2D SESSION
H. R. 5337

AN ACT To provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Air Force Academy Act".

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Department of the Air Force a United States Air Force Academy, hereinafter referred to as the "Academy", for the instruction and preparation for military service of selected persons who shall be known as Air Force cadets.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Air Force shall determine the location of the Academy within the United States in the following manner:

(1) The Secretary of the Air Force shall establish immediately a commission, and appoint five members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the Academy. The commission shall make its report to the Secretary as soon as practicable.

(2) The Secretary shall accept the unanimous decision for a permanent location by such commission. In the event such recommendation is not unanimous, the commission by a majority vote shall submit to the Secretary three sites from which the Secretary shall select one as the permanent location.

(b) Following the selection of a location for the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized—

(1) to acquire land from other Government agencies without reimbursement, with the consent of such agencies;

(2) to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 601, Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365; 40 U. S. C. 551);

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

(3) to prepare plans, specifications, and designs, to make surveys and to do all other preparatory work, by contract or otherwise, as he deems necessary or advisable in connection with the construction, equipping and organization of the Academy at such location; and

(4) to construct and equip temporary or permanent Public Works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, at such location.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of providing temporary facilities and enabling early operation of the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to provide for the erection of the minimum additional number of temporary buildings and the modification of existing structures and facilities at an existing Air Force base and to provide for the proper functioning equipping, maintaining, and repairing thereof; and to contract with civilian institutions for such operation or instruction as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 5. All appropriate provisions of law, not inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, which pertain to the United States Military Academy shall, by the authority of this section, also pertain to the United States Air Force Academy. All references in these laws to the Secretary of the Army, the Army, or any officer or agency thereof shall, in pertaining to the Air Force Academy, be construed as referring, respectively, to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Air Force, and such officers and agencies of the Air Force as he may designate. The organization of the Air Force Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

SEC. 6. To permit an orderly increase in the number of Air Force cadets during the period ending not more than four years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Secretary of the Air Force may limit the number to be appointed each year during that period in the following manner:

(a) Each Senator and Representative shall nominate not to exceed ten persons, who shall be eligible to take a competitive examination which shall be held annually. The number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportional to the representation in Congress from that State. Appointments from each State shall be made from among qualified candidates nominated from that State in the order of merit established by the examinations.

(b) Vacancies allocated to other sources shall be filled from among qualified candidates in each category in order of merit established by similar competitive examinations and shall not exceed 15 per centum of the total number of appointments authorized.

SEC. 7. Section 302 (b) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 329; 10 U. S. C. 1832 (b)) is amended by inserting after the words "provided by law," the words "the professors and cadets of the Air Force Academy,".

SEC. 8. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each cadet at the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy and each midshipman at the United States Naval Academy shall, prior to his graduation from such Academy, be afforded an opportunity to state a preference for appointment as a commissioned officer of the United States Army, the United States

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

Navy, the United States Air Force, or the United States Marine Corps, upon his graduation, and, with the consent of the Secretaries of the military departments having jurisdiction over such Academy and over the armed force in which he prefers appointment, shall, upon his graduation, be accepted for appointment in such armed force, except that not more than 12½ per centum of the members of any graduating class of any such Academy shall be appointed as commissioned officers in armed forces other than the one administering such Academy. For the purposes of the foregoing limitations, graduates of the United States Naval Academy appointed as commissioned officers in the United States Marine Corps shall not be considered as having been commissioned in armed forces other than the United States Navy.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall by regulation provide for the equitable and fair distribution of appointments made pursuant to this section in the event that more than 12½ per centum of a graduating class of any academy referred to herein expresses a preference to be so appointed.

(c) The provisions of this section shall take effect (1) in the year in which the first class of the United States Air Force Academy graduates, or (2) upon the rescission of the present agreement under which graduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies may volunteer for appointment in the United States Air Force, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$126,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act, of which not to exceed \$26,000,000 shall be appropriated for any period beginning prior to

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

January 1, 1955. Of the amount so appropriated for any such period, not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be utilized for the purpose of section 4 of this Act.

Approved April 1, 1954.

In addition to the foregoing, the bill also provides additional monetary authorization to correct deficiencies in authorization for certain projects authorized under previous military construction acts. There follows a listing by individual project and public law of the amounts previously authorized and the amounts as changed by the bill:

Public law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
Public Law 209, 83d	Sec. 101	Red River Arsenal, Tex.	\$1,803,000	\$2,212,000	Sec. 104.
Public Law 534, 83d	do ¹	Department of Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Md.	2,360,000	3,137,000	Sec. 105.
Do	do	United States Military Academy, N. Y.	9,950,000	11,983,000	Do.
Public Law 161, 84th	do	Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.	1,736,000	2,039,000	Sec. 106.
Do	do	Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y.	129,000	212,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Lee, Va.	8,589,000	9,874,000	Do.
Do	do	Camp Detrick, Md.	452,000	525,000	Do.
Do	do	Dugway Proving Ground, Utah.	1,129,000	1,491,000	Do.
Do	do	Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y.	1,055,000	1,240,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Eustis, Va.	6,597,000	8,072,000	Do.
Do	do	Brooke Army Medical Center, Tex.	549,000	876,000	Do.
Do	do	Madigan Army Hospital, Wash.	333,000	669,000	Do.
Do	do	Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C.	3,557,000	4,472,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Holabird, Md.	612,000	800,000	Do.
Do	do	Camp Jackson, S. C.	5,000,000	10,400,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Hood, Tex.	12,922,000	14,283,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Carson, Colo.	7,487,000	8,621,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	8,615,000	9,893,000	Do.
Do	do	Camp Lucas, Mich.	145,000	193,000	Do.
Do	do	Armed Forces special weapons project, various installations.	3,014,000	3,204,000	Do.
Do	do	Wildwood Station, Kenai (Alaska area).	469,000	559,000	Do.
Public Law 968, 84th Cong.	do	Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y.	88,000	136,000	Sec. 107.
Do	do	Redstone Arsenal, Ala.	6,159,000	8,593,000	Do.
Do	do	Atlanta General Depot, Ga.	832,000	984,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Worth General Depot, Tex.	1,285,000	1,847,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Bliss, Tex.	5,301,000	8,293,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Sill, Okla.	4,173,000	5,798,000	Do.
Do	do	Fort Leavenworth, Kans.	1,092,000	1,373,000	Do.
Do	Sec. 102	Classified installations	200,783,000	203,331,000	Do.
Public Law 534, 82d Cong.	Sec. 201	Yards and docks facilities, various locations.	4,500,000	5,460,000	Sec. 203.
Do	Sec. 202	Classified installations	86,397,000	95,489,000	Do.
Public Law 534, 83d	Sec. 201	Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.	225,000	369,000	Sec. 204.
Do	do	Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.	1,675,000	2,030,000	Do.
Do	do	Naval air station, Glenview, Ill.	70,000	170,000	Do.
Do	Sec. 202	Classified installations	63,358,000	70,656,000	Do.
Public Law 161, 84th	Sec. 201	Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Calif.	629,000	1,099,000	Sec. 205.
Do	do	Naval station, Orange, Tex.	399,000	563,000	Do.
Do	do	Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.	3,686,000	4,292,000	Do.
Do	do	Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, La.	24,361,000	26,871,000	Do.

¹ As amended by Public Law 161, 84th Cong.

Public law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
Public Law 161, 84th..	Sec. 201	Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.	\$3,729,000	\$4,217,000	Sec. 205.
Do.....	do.....	Naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif.	2,581,000	4,355,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Fla.	1,087,000	1,587,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.	16,311,000	17,911,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval Ordnance Acrophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex.	1,111,000	1,751,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif.	375,000	475,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval Powder Factory Indian Head Md.	780,000	879,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval station Kwajalein Marshall Islands.	4,411,000	5,235,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval communication facility Port Lyautey French Morocco.	2,848,600	3,198,600	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Classified installations.....	151,342,400	152,763,400	Do.
Public Law 968 84th..	Sec. 201	Naval shipyard Charleston S. C.	148,000	191,000	Sec. 206.
Do.....	do.....	Naval shipyard Long Beach Calif.	5,984,000	8,619,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval station Long Beach Calif.	2,256,000	2,623,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval station Norfolk Va.	2,844,000	3,340,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval air station Miramar Calif.	8,835,000	11,040,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval Air Missile Test Center Point Mugu Calif.	1,682,000	2,010,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval Academy Annapolis Md.	7,469,000	10,919,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval communication station San Francisco, Calif.	2,029,000	3,779,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Public works center, Norfolk, Va.	443,000	500,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan.	1,961,000	2,337,000	Do.
Do.....	Sec. 203	Classified installations.....	84,043,000	85,939,000	Do.
Public Law 534, 83d..	Sec. 301 ²	Pescadero Consolan Station, Calif.	224,000	584,000	Sec. 303.
Do.....	do.....	Clinton-Sherman Airport, Okla.	11,393,000	12,686,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y.	729,000	929,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.	27,478,000	29,442,000	Do.
Public Law 161, 84th..	do.....	Geiger Field, Wash.	1,716,000	2,717,000	Sec. 304.
Do.....	do. ³	Grand Forks site, North Dakota.	7,709,000	9,220,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.	2,029,000	2,195,000	Do.
Do.....	do. ⁴	Minot site, North Dakota.	6,603,000	7,268,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif.	2,445,000	2,935,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich.	5,526,000	6,445,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio.	742,000	893,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Yuma County Airport, Ariz.	2,107,000	2,676,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Brookley Air Force Base, Ala.	4,170,000	4,728,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y.	15,803,000	16,654,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	McClellan Air Force Base, Calif.	9,522,000	11,970,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.	12,001,000	14,508,000	Do.
Do.....	do. ⁵	Ellington Air Force Base, Tex.	3,438,000	3,876,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Goodfellow Air Force Base, Tex.	4,081,000	5,088,000	Do.
Do.....	do. ⁶	Greenville Air Force Base, Miss.	500,000	545,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Harlingen Air Force Base, Tex.	446,000	529,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	James Connally Air Force Base, Tex.	883,000	1,129,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Mather Air Force Base, Calif.	1,516,000	1,998,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Reese Air Force Base, Tex.	1,076,000	1,304,000	Do.
Do.....	do. ⁷	Williams Air Force Base, Ariz.	1,215,000	1,556,000	Do.
Do.....	do.....	Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.	520,000	825,000	Do.

² As amended by Public Law 161, 84th Cong.³ As amended by Public Law 968, 84th Cong.⁴ As amended by Public Law 968, 84th Cong.⁵ As amended by Public Law 968, 84th Cong.⁶ As amended by Public Law 968, 84th Cong.⁷ As amended by Public Law 968, 84th Cong.

Public law	Section	Installation	Existing amount authorized	As amended by bill	Section of bill
Public Law 161, 84th	Sec. 301	Indian Springs Air Force Base, Nev.	\$555, 500	\$624, 500	Sec. 304.
Do.....	do	Carswell Air Force Base, Tex.	5, 929, 000	7, 363, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Dow Air Force Base, Maine	11, 155, 000	12, 218, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Travis Air Force Base, Calif.	9, 769, 000	11, 473, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex.	6, 657, 000	8, 324, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Alexandria Air Force Base, La.	\$2, 684, 000	\$3, 527, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind.	559, 000	611, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	George Air Force Base, Calif.	1, 598, 000	1, 905, 000	Do.
Do.....	do ⁸	Larson Air Force Base, Wash.	4, 724, 000	5, 197, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Stewart Air Force Base, Tenn.	3, 589, 000	4, 010, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Galena Airfield, Alaska	518, 000	735, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Area control navigational aids, various locations.	526, 000	1, 394, 000	Do.
Public Law 968/84th	do	Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.	863, 000	1, 469, 000	Sec. 305.
Do.....	do	Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.	2, 827, 000	3, 079, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.	2, 470, 000	3, 080, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak.	18, 969, 000	30, 521, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Grandview Air Force Base, Miss.	1, 673, 000	1, 781, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.	2, 156, 000	2, 336, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Oreg.	1, 130, 000	1, 560, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak.	21, 215, 000	27, 035, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, N. Y.	3, 030, 000	3, 409, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif.	2, 392, 000	2, 779, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa.	2, 288, 000	2, 900, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Truax Field, Wis.	4, 876, 000	8, 725, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.	3, 278, 000	3, 808, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Air Defense Command, various locations.	21, 510, 000	26, 201, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Griffiss Air Force Base, N. Y.	17, 966, 000	22, 005, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Maine.	473, 000	745, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Wash.	129, 000	251, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.	5, 990, 000	7, 763, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex.	17, 121, 000	26, 471, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Craig Air Force Base, Ala.	18, 000	22, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex.	24, 433, 000	33, 858, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Stead Air Force Base, Nev.	2, 221, 000	3, 063, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Vance Air Force Base, Okla.	977, 000	1, 064, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.	215, 000	311, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Beale Air Force Base, Calif.	13, 395, 000	15, 993, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Dobbins Air Force Base, Ga.	345, 000	500, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Mass.	6, 939, 000	7, 530, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.	5, 488, 000	7, 220, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Biggs Air Force Base, Tex.	922, 000	1, 190, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Castle Air Force Base, Calif.	2, 179, 000	2, 643, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Columbus Air Force Base, Miss.	14, 518, 000	15, 322, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak.	943, 000	1, 075, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Homestead Air Force Base, Fla.	1, 694, 000	1, 966, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio.	4, 952, 000	7, 880, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.	1, 236, 000	1, 586, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho.	2, 064, 000	2, 607, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.	5, 697, 000	6, 155, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Plattsburgh Air Force Base, N. Y.	1, 491, 000	2, 027, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Portsmouth Air Force Base, N. H.	661, 000	720, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Walker Air Force Base, N. Mex.	2, 791, 000	3, 181, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Langley Air Force Base, Va.	2, 613, 000	2, 785, 000	Do.
Do.....	do	Northeast Air Command, various locations.	75, 650, 000	94, 197, 000	Do.

⁸ As amended by Public Law 968, 84th Cong.

The above increases in monetary authorization for projects authorized by prior military construction acts require the following changes to be made in the general provisions of such acts as follows:

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

The Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606) (Public Law 534, 82d Cong.), as amended
(Sec. 402:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act but not to exceed—

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, \$138,183,000; outside continental United States, \$32,295,000; classified facilities, \$86,397,000; or a total of \$256,875,000.

(Sec. 203 (c):)

Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,927,000".

The Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 440) (Public Law 209, 83d Cong.), as amended

(Sec. 502:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, \$44,003,000; outside continental United States, \$20,560,000; classified facilities, \$69,108,000; or a total of \$133,671,000.

(Sec. 104 (b):)

Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000", respectively.

The Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 535) (Public Law 534, 83d Cong.), as amended

(Sec. 502:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, \$129,096,000; outside continental United States, \$19,264,000; classified installations and facilities, \$87,700,000; or a total of \$236,060,000;

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, \$102,956,000; outside continental United States, \$36,493,000; classified installations and facilities, \$63,358,000; or a total of \$202,807,000;

(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States, \$406,120,000; outside continental United States, \$9,829,000; or a total of \$415,949,000; and

(4) for public works authorized by title IV; a total of \$572,600.

The Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324) (Public Law 161, 84th Cong.), as amended (Sec. 502:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, \$225,277,000; outside continental United States, \$74,984,000; section 102, \$223,993,000; section 103, \$10,000,000; or a total of \$534,254,000;

(Sec. (105 (b))):

Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,870,000", respectively.

(Sec. 204 (c):)

Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$102,956,000", "\$63,358,000", "\$202,807,000 and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$103,555,000", "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000".

(Sec. 303 (b):)

Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 so much as reads "\$406,120,000" and "\$415,949,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$409,937,000" and "\$419,766,000", respectively.

(Sec. 106 (c):)

Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$230,677,000", "\$74,984,000", and "\$534,254,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$240,220,000", "\$75,074,000", and "\$549,287,000", respectively.

EXISTING LAW

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, \$299,512,600; outside continental United States \$107,191,300; section 202, \$151,342,400; section 203, \$6,000,000; or a total of \$564,046,300;

(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States, \$801,256,000; outside continental United States, \$532,454,000; section 302, \$5,000,000; section 303, \$350,000; or a total of \$1,339,060,000; and

(4) for public works authorized by title IV: \$54,500,000.

THE BILL

(Sec. (205d):)

Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300", "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300", "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

(Sec. 304 (c):)

Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$801,256,000", "\$532,454,000", and "\$1,339,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$824,300,000", "\$533,539,000", and "\$1,363,189,000", respectively.

The Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) (Public Law 968, 84th Cong.)

(Sec. 402:)

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$86,916,000; outside the United States, \$35,763,000; section 102, \$200,783,000; or a total of \$323,462,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$292,572,000; outside the United States, \$61,625,000; section 203, \$84,043,000, or a total of \$438,240,000; and

(Sec. 107 (c):)

Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,000", "\$203,331,000, and "\$334,104,000, respectively.

(Sec. 206 (d):)

Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000", and "\$438,240,000" and inserting re-

EXISTING LAW

THE BILL

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$742,873,000; outside the United States, \$405,061,000; section 302 (a), \$163,000,000; section 302 (b), \$50,000,000 or a total of \$1,360,934,000.

spectively in place thereof “\$303,453,000”, “\$62,001,000”, “\$85,939,000”, and “\$451,399,000”.
(Sec. 305 (c):)
Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts “\$742,873,000”, “\$ 4 0 5 , 0 6 1 , 0 0 0 ”, a n d “\$1,360,934,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$811,342,000”, “\$ 4 2 3 , 6 0 8 , 0 0 0 ”, a n d “\$1,447,950,000”, respectively.

	Continental United States	Overseas	Classified	Total
Army-----	\$120, 099, 000	\$34, 613, 000	\$143, 002, 000	\$297, 714, 000
Navy-----	260, 377, 000	65, 627, 000	55, 091, 000	391, 095, 000
Air Force-----	437, 357, 000	225, 407, 000	65, 000, 000	727, 764, 000
Total-----	817, 833, 000	325, 647, 000	273, 093, 000	1, 416, 573, 000

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS BILL FISCAL YEAR 1958

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alabama-----	\$10, 366, 000
Army:	
Anniston Ordnance Depot-----	2, 015, 000
Fort Rucker-----	5, 703, 000
Air Force:	
Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile-----	405, 000
Craig Air Force Base, Selma-----	2, 193, 000
Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery-----	50, 000
Arizona-----	7, 322, 000
Army: Fort Huachuca-----	1, 936, 000
Air Force:	
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson-----	2, 411, 000
Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix-----	2, 110, 000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler-----	865, 000
Arkansas-----	11, 510, 000
Air Force: Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville-----	11, 510, 000
California-----	133, 918, 000
Army:	
Jet Propulsion Laboratory-----	130, 000
Oakland Army Base-----	602, 000
Fort Ord-----	5, 231, 000
Sharpe General Depot-----	110, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Alameda-----	185, 000
Marine Corps supply center, Barstow-----	8, 001, 000
Naval ordnance test station, China Lake-----	114, 000
Naval ordnance laboratory, Corona-----	494, 000
Auxiliary landing field, Crows Landing-----	39, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

California—Continued

Navy—Continued

Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro.....	\$4, 774, 000
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro.....	3, 620, 000
Naval air station, Lemoore.....	30, 594, 000
Naval shipyard, Long Beach.....	1, 500, 000
Naval station, Long Beach.....	544, 000
Naval air station, Miramar.....	3, 401, 000
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave.....	3, 281, 000
Naval air station, North Island.....	7, 964, 000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton.....	1, 469, 000
Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu.....	3, 479, 000
Naval magazine, Port Chicago.....	723, 000
Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme.....	759, 000
Auxiliary landing field, San Clemente.....	9, 448, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego.....	116, 000
Naval training center, San Diego.....	5, 375, 000
Naval communication station, San Diego.....	100, 000
Naval communication center, Stockton.....	460, 000
Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms.....	2, 331, 000

Air Force:

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville.....	9, 680, 000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced.....	2, 976, 000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc.....	1, 987, 000
George Air Force Base, Victorville.....	2, 478, 000
Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael.....	614, 000
March Air Force Base, Riverside.....	2, 347, 000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento.....	8, 249, 000
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento.....	5, 133, 000
Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard.....	2, 082, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield.....	3, 528, 000

Colorado..... 2, 122, 000

Army:

Fort Carson.....	1, 049, 000
Fitzsimons Army Hospital.....	937, 000

Air Force: Peterson Field, Colorado Springs..... 136, 000

Connecticut..... 2, 966, 000

Navy: Naval submarine base, New London..... 2, 966, 000

Delaware..... 2, 089, 000

Air Force: Dover Air Force Base, Dover..... 2, 089, 000

District of Columbia..... 2, 100, 000

Army: Walter Reed Army Medical Center..... 1, 920, 000

Navy: Naval research laboratory, Washington..... 180, 000

Florida..... 30, 142, 000

Navy:

Naval air station, Cecil Field.....	7, 751, 000
Naval air station, Jacksonville.....	39, 000
Naval air station, Key West.....	1, 456, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Mayport.....	384, 000
Naval air station, Pensacola.....	6, 225, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Saufley Field.....	39, 000

Air Force:

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso.....	6, 784, 000
Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead.....	380, 000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa.....	936, 000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa.....	2, 962, 000
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City.....	3, 186, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Georgia-----	\$37, 508, 000
Army:	
Fort Benning-----	1, 583, 000
Atlanta General Depot-----	595, 000
Fort Stewart-----	3, 691, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany-----	140, 000
Naval air station, Glynco-----	293, 000
Air Force:	
Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta-----	139, 000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah-----	994, 000
Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta-----	938, 000
Robins Air Force Base, Macon-----	20, 507, 000
Turner Air Force Base, Albany-----	8, 628, 000
Idaho-----	2, 022, 000
Air Force: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home-----	2, 022, 000
Illinois-----	7, 866, 000
Army:	
Granite City Engineer Depot-----	765, 000
Savanna Ordnance Depot-----	758, 000
Navy:	
Electronics supply office, Great Lakes-----	92, 000
Naval training center, Great Lakes-----	5, 598, 000
Air Force: Scott Air Force Base, Belleville-----	653, 000
Indiana-----	9, 584, 000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru-----	9, 584, 000
Iowa-----	248, 000
Air Force: Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City-----	248, 000
Kansas-----	8, 873, 000
Army:	
Fort Leavenworth-----	336, 000
Fort Riley-----	2, 525, 000
Air Force:	
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka-----	1, 357, 000
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita-----	763, 000
Schilling Air Force Base, Salina-----	3, 892, 000
Kentucky-----	9, 322, 000
Army:	
Fort Campbell-----	5, 117, 000
Fort Knox-----	4, 205, 000
Louisiana-----	16, 468, 000
Army: Fort Polk-----	7, 734, 000
Navy: Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia-----	3, 653, 000
Air Force:	
England Air Force Base, Alexandria-----	1, 558, 000
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport-----	3, 344, 000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles-----	179, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Maine-----	\$36, 487, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Brunswick-----	180, 000
Naval radio station, Washington County-----	13, 982, 000
Air Force:	
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor-----	14, 759, 000
Loring Air Force Base, Limestone-----	7, 322, 000
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle-----	244, 000
Maryland-----	16, 503, 000
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground-----	2, 288, 000
Fort Detrick-----	627, 000
Fort George G. Meade-----	2, 652, 000
Fort Ritchie-----	820, 000
Navy:	
Naval Academy, Annapolis-----	1, 602, 000
Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis-----	618, 000
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock-----	115, 000
Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County-----	1, 452, 000
Naval air station, Patuxent River-----	2, 209, 000
John H. Towers Field (location to be determined)-----	3, 200, 000
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs-----	920, 000
Massachusetts-----	12, 863, 000
Army: Fort Devens-----	4, 859, 000
Air Force:	
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford-----	4, 029, 000
Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth-----	2, 074, 000
Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls-----	1, 901, 000
Michigan-----	7, 141, 000
Air Force:	
Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie-----	429, 000
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette-----	905, 000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens-----	2, 898, 000
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda-----	2, 909, 000
Minnesota-----	4, 499, 000
Air Force: Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth-----	4, 499, 000
Mississippi-----	39, 133, 000
Navy: Naval auxiliary air station, Meridian-----	15, 067, 000
Air Force:	
Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus-----	2, 468, 000
Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville-----	19, 389, 000
Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi-----	2, 209, 000
Missouri-----	7, 702, 000
Army: Fort Leonard Wood-----	4, 663, 000
Air Force:	
Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, St. Louis---	620, 000
Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City-----	2, 184, 000
Whiteman Air Force Base, Knoboster-----	235, 000
Montana-----	5, 566, 000
Air Force:	
Glasgow site-----	2, 048, 000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls-----	3, 518, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Nebraska-----	\$7, 967, 000
Army: Sioux Ordnance Depot-----	249, 000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln-----	37, 000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha-----	7, 681, 000
Nevada-----	6, 786, 000
Navy: Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon-----	4, 199, 000
Air Force:	
Indian Springs Air Force Base-----	206, 000
Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas-----	436, 000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno-----	1, 945, 000
New Hampshire-----	5, 231, 000
Army: Cold Regions Laboratory-----	2, 496, 000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth-----	391, 000
Air Force: Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth-----	2, 344, 000
New Jersey-----	799, 000
Army: Fort Dix-----	303, 000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown-----	496, 000
New Mexico-----	43, 068, 000
Army: White Sands Proving Ground-----	16, 530, 000
Air Force:	
Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis-----	2, 149, 000
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo-----	11, 869, 000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell-----	9, 697, 000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque-----	2, 823, 000
New York-----	20, 113, 000
Army:	
Brooklyn Army Base-----	1, 169, 000
United States Military Academy-----	1, 666, 000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn-----	1, 784, 000
Air Force:	
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome-----	10, 659, 000
Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead-----	337, 000
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport-----	974, 000
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh-----	231, 000
Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh-----	2, 149, 000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton-----	1, 144, 000
North Carolina-----	29, 427, 000
Army: Fort Bragg-----	1, 051, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point-----	6, 503, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Edenton-----	199, 000
Naval seaplane facility, Hertford-----	5, 728, 000
Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, Jacksonville-----	132, 000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune-----	4, 256, 000
Air Force: Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro-----	11, 558, 000
North Dakota-----	11, 270, 000
Air Force:	
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks-----	4, 466, 000
Minot Air Force Base, Minot-----	6, 804, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Ohio.....	\$4, 799, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus.....	2, 364, 000
Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton.....	2, 077, 000
Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown.....	358, 000
<hr/>	
Oklahoma.....	6, 035, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
Altus Air Force Base, Altus.....	848, 000
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton.....	536, 000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City.....	2, 674, 000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid.....	1, 977, 000
<hr/>	
Oregon.....	5, 627, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath.....	1, 299, 000
Portland International Airport, Portland.....	4, 328, 000
<hr/>	
Pennsylvania.....	5, 319, 000
<hr/>	
Army: New Cumberland General Depot.....	464, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville.....	39, 000
Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg.....	155, 000
Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia.....	550, 000
Air Force:	
Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown.....	1, 673, 000
Marietta Air Force Station.....	2, 438, 000
<hr/>	
Rhode Island.....	5, 591, 000
<hr/>	
Navy:	
Naval communication station, Newport.....	1, 397, 000
Naval station, Newport.....	3, 312, 000
Naval air station, Quonset Point.....	882, 000
<hr/>	
South Carolina.....	13, 253, 000
<hr/>	
Army: Charleston Transportation Corps Depot.....	306, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort.....	2, 632, 000
Naval receiving station, Charleston.....	1, 225, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island.....	3, 199, 000
Air Force:	
Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston.....	2, 216, 000
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville.....	1, 287, 000
Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach.....	1, 204, 000
Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter.....	1, 184, 000
<hr/>	
South Dakota.....	2, 314, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City.....	2, 258, 000
Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City.....	56, 000
<hr/>	
Tennessee.....	1, 034, 000
<hr/>	
Air Force:	
McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville.....	289, 000
Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna.....	745, 000
<hr/>	

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Texas-----	\$49,692,000
Army:	
Fort Bliss-----	7,704,000
Fort Hood-----	2,362,000
Fort Worth General Depot-----	95,000
Fort Sam Houston-----	675,000
Navy:	
Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field-----	566,000
Naval air station, Corpus Christi-----	140,000
Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield-----	2,649,000
Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville-----	160,000
Air Force:	
Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo-----	4,785,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin-----	1,487,000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso-----	5,557,000
Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio-----	952,000
Air Force:	
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth-----	\$2,059,000
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene-----	100,000
Foster Air Force Base, Victoria-----	760,000
Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo-----	489,000
Gray Air Force Base, Killeen-----	34,000
Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen-----	424,000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio-----	899,000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio-----	250,000
Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman-----	460,000
Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio-----	2,858,000
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock-----	5,909,000
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls-----	4,200,000
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring-----	4,118,000
Utah-----	4,000,000
Army: Dugway Proving Ground-----	54,000
Air Force:	
Hill Air Force Base, Ogden-----	1,911,000
Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover-----	2,035,000
Vermont-----	594,000
Air Force: Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski-----	594,000
Virginia-----	41,478,000
Army:	
Fort Belvoir-----	1,654,000
Fort Eustis-----	3,039,000
A. P. Hill Military Reservation-----	153,000
Fort Lee-----	6,229,000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Norfolk-----	5,467,000
Naval base, Norfolk-----	7,808,000
Navy:	
Naval communication station, Norfolk-----	443,000
Naval Shipyard, Norfolk-----	2,998,000
Public Works Center, Norfolk-----	3,244,000
Naval air station, Oceana-----	6,975,000
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico-----	2,213,000
Air Force: Langley Air Force Base, Hampton-----	1,255,000
Washington-----	54,924,000
Army:	
Fort Lewis-----	1,487,000
Seattle Market Center-----	40,000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Washington—Continued

Navy:

Naval ammunition depot, Bangor-----	\$316, 000
Naval Shipyard, Bremerton-----	25, 438, 000
Naval air station, Whidbey Island-----	9, 365, 000

Air Force:

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane-----	1, 480, 000
Geiger Field, Spokane-----	1, 583, 000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake-----	13, 112, 000
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma-----	2, 103, 000

Wisconsin-----	8, 932, 000
----------------	-------------

Air Force:

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville-----	7, 804, 000
Truax Field, Madison-----	1, 128, 000

Various locations (Zone of Interior)-----	65, 260, 000
---	--------------

Army-----	9, 522, 000
-----------	-------------

Air Force-----	55, 738, 000
----------------	--------------

Classified (Zone of Interior)-----	236, 104, 000
------------------------------------	---------------

Army-----	125, 750, 000
-----------	---------------

Navy-----	45, 354, 000
-----------	--------------

Air Force-----	65, 000, 000
----------------	--------------

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaska-----	\$14, 903, 000
-------------	----------------

Army: Alaska general-----	4, 143, 000
---------------------------	-------------

Navy:

Naval communication station, Adak-----	1, 053, 000
Naval station, Adak-----	2, 555, 000

Air Force:

Eielson Air Force Base-----	430, 000
Elmendorf Air Force Base-----	4, 742, 000
Galena Airfield-----	350, 000
Ladd Air Force Base-----	1, 630, 000

Newfoundland-----	2, 691, 000
-------------------	-------------

Navy: Naval station, Argentia-----	2, 691, 000
------------------------------------	-------------

Canal Zone-----	1, 689, 000
-----------------	-------------

Army: Fort Gulick-----	289, 000
------------------------	----------

Air Force: Howard Air Force Base-----	1, 400, 000
---------------------------------------	-------------

Cuba-----	11, 522, 000
-----------	--------------

Navy:

Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay-----	5, 730, 000
Naval station, Guantanamo Bay-----	4, 699, 000
Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay-----	1, 093, 000

France-----	20, 754, 000
-------------	--------------

Army: Various locations-----	20, 754, 000
------------------------------	--------------

Guam-----	1, 906, 000
-----------	-------------

Navy:

Commissary store, naval station-----	884, 000
Naval air station, Agana-----	428, 000
Naval communication station, Finegayan-----	594, 000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Hawaii-----	\$16,837,000
Army: Tripler Army Hospital-----	154,000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Barbers Point-----	2,088,000
Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay-----	249,000
Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Pacific and Pacific Fleet, Oahu-----	332,000
Naval ammunition depot, Oahu-----	904,000
Naval shipyard, Pearl Harbor-----	6,076,000
Naval radio station, Wahiawa-----	4,392,000
Air Force: Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu-----	2,642,000
Japan-----	795,000
Navy:	
Naval activity Sakata-----	69,000
Naval activity, southern Japan-----	726,000
Korea-----	9,000,000
Army: Various locations-----	9,000,000
Kwajalein-----	69,000
Navy: Naval station, Kwajalein-----	69,000
Mariana Islands-----	820,000
Air Force: Andersen Air Force Base-----	820,000
Midway-----	69,000
Navy: Naval station, Midway Island-----	69,000
Okinawa-----	504,000
Navy: Naval air facility, Naha-----	504,000
Philippines-----	14,920,000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Cubi Point-----	149,000
Naval base, Subic Bay-----	3,287,000
Naval station, Subic Bay-----	8,993,000
Naval supply depot, Subic Bay-----	2,098,000
Public works center, Subic Bay-----	393,000
Puerto Rico-----	19,428,000
Army: Fort Buchanan-----	273,000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Roosevelt Roads-----	15,182,000
Naval station, San Juan-----	190,000
Air Force: Ramey Air Force Base-----	3,783,000
Various locations, overseas-----	209,740,000
Navy-----	130,000
Air Force-----	209,610,000
Classified locations, overseas-----	36,989,000
Army-----	17,252,000
Navy-----	19,737,000

Union Calendar No. 224

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

[Report No. 638]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 19, 1957

Mr. VINSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

JUNE 26, 1957

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in *italic*]

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
7 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
8 tion, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following
9 projects:

1 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

2 TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

3 (Ordnance Corps)

4 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
5 \$2,288,000.

6 Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,-
7 000.

8 Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,-
9 000.

10 Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
11 and utilities, \$758,000.

12 Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
13 \$249,000.

14 White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
16 development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
17 ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,-
18 530,000.

19 (Quartermaster Corps)

20 Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
21 land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

22 New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
23 tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

24 Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
25 ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

1 Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:
2 Land acquisition, \$40,000.

3 Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,
4 and utilities, \$110,000.

5 Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,
6 and land acquisition, \$95,000.

7 (Chemical Corps)

8 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-
10 000.

11 (Signal Corps)

12 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

13 (Corps of Engineers)

14 Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-
15 search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

16 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training
17 facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

18 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
19 000.

20 (Transportation Corps)

21 Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
22 \$1,169,000.

23 Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
24 facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
14 utilities, \$4,859,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,703,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

1 (Fifth Army Area)

2 Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

3 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

4 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance
5 facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

6 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing,
7 \$4,663,000.

8 (Sixth Army Area)

9 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, mainte-
10 nance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility,
11 and utilities, \$1,487,000.

12 Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance
13 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,231,000.

14 (Military Academy)

15 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
16 York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

17 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

18 Various installations: Operational facility, community
19 facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

20 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

21 Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance fa-
22 cilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community
23 facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities,
24 \$8,466,000.

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
5 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
6 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
7 military tactical installations for assignment as public
8 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
9 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
10 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
11 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
12 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
13 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
14 structed with appropriated funds.

15 SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
16 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
17 STATES" in section 101, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
19 TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,
20 Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,212,000".

22 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$44,003,000” and “\$133,671,000” and
3 inserting in place thereof “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,-
4 000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
6 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
7 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

8 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
9 TIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Department of the
10 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
11 land, strike out “\$2,360,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$3,137,000”.

13 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
14 (Military Academy)” with respect to United States Military
15 Academy, New York, strike out “\$9,950,000” and insert
16 in place thereof “\$11,983,000”.

17 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts “\$129,096,000” and “\$236,060,000”
20 and inserting in place thereof “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,-
21 870,000”, respectively.

1 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
2 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
3 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

4 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
5 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

6 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,
7 Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place
8 thereof "\$2,039,000".

9 (2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
10 York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$212,000".

12 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
13 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee,
14 Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof
15 "\$9,874,000".

16 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
17 TIES (Chemical Corps)"—

18 (1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,
19 strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof
20 "\$525,000".

21 (2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,
22 Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place
23 thereof "\$1,491,000".

24 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
25 TIES (Transportation Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,240,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,072,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Medical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof "\$876,000".

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Washington, strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof "\$669,000".

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Maryland, strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof "\$800,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, South Carolina, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,400,000".

1 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
2 (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
3 strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof
4 "\$14,283,000".

5 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (Fifth Army Area)"—

7 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
8 out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,-
9 000".

10 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
11 strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$9,893,000".

13 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
14 out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

15 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
16 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect
17 to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert
18 in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
21 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "Alaskan Area"—with respect to
23 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$559,000".

25 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and
3 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$240,220,-
4 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$549,287,000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress
6 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
7 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

8 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
9 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

10 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
11 York, strike out “\$88,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$136,000”.

13 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
14 strike out “\$6,159,000” and insert in place thereof
15 “\$8,593,000”.

16 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
17 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—

18 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
19 out “\$832,000” and insert in place thereof “\$984,000”.

20 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
21 Texas, strike out “\$1,285,000” and insert in place
22 thereof “\$1,847,000”.

23 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES”—

24 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
25 “\$5,301,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,293,000”.

1 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
2 “\$4,173,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,798,000”.

3 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
4 strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof
5 "\$1,373,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, “\$200,-783,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$203,331,000”.

9 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
10 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
11 tion 402 the amounts “\$86,916,000”, “\$200,783,000”, and
12 “\$323,462,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$95,010,-
13 000”, “\$203,331,000”, and “\$334,104,000”, respectively.

14 TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

21 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

23 Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis,
24 Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000,

1 Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock
2 \$25,438,000.

3 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
4 \$1,452,000.

5 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland:
6 Utilities, \$115,000.

7 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
8 remedying effects of ground subsidence, ~~\$4,660,000~~
9 \$1,500,000.

10 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
11 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

12 Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,-
13 998,000.

14 Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
15 facilities, \$391,000.

16 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

17 Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,
18 \$1,326,000.

19 Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
20 facilities, \$544,000.

21 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
22 community facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

23 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
24 \$7,808,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, \$566,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,067,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
2 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
3 \$7,751,000.

4 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Califor-
5 nia: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
6 \$39,000.

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:
8 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

9 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:
10 Operational facilities, messhall, and land acquisition,
11 \$4,774,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-
13 ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

14 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
15 Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,
16 and utilities, \$5,728,000.

17 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
18 facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational
20 facilities, (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

21 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
22 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

23 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
24 tional facilities, \$384,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
2 cilities, \$3,401,000.

3 Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
4 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

5 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
6 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

7 Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and
8 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
9 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
11 tional facilities, (aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,
13 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
14 utilities, \$9,448,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Op-
16 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

17 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

18 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
19 Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
20 istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

21 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
22 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
23 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$6,503,000.

1 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-
2 tional facilities, \$3,620,000.

3 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California:
4 Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

5 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
6 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

7 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

8 Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsyl-
9 vania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-
11 tional facilities, \$2,209,000.

12 Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:
13 Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San
14 Nicolas Island), \$3,479,000.

15 Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field (location
16 to be determined) : Land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

17 SUPPLY FACILITIES

18 Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Admin-
19 istrative facilities, \$92,000.

20 Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Penn-
21 sylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

22 Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ad-
23 ministrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,001,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,256,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utilities, \$316,000.

1 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
2 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

3 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
4 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

5 Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
6 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

7 Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Mary-
8 land: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

9 Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance
10 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

11 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

12 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory
13 foundations, \$1,602,000.

14 Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, South Carolina:
15 Troop housing, \$1,225,000.

16 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training
17 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

18 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training
19 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,375,000.

20 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

21 Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-
22 ational facilities, \$443,000.

23 Naval Communication Station, Newport, Rhode Island:
24 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

1 Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:
2 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

3 Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Op-
4 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

5 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Op-
6 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

7 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

8 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
9 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

10 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

11 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
12 000.

13 Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
14 244,000.

15 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,
16 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
17 \$759,000.

18 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

19 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

20 Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
21 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
22 076,000.

23 Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
24 Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and
25 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000,

1 Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
2 Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
3 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

4 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

5 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
6 munity facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

7 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
8 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administration facilities and
9 utilities, \$332,000.

10 Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,-
11 699,000.

12 Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
13 000.

14 AVIATION FACILITIES

15 Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
16 erational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,-
17 000.

18 Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and
19 community facilities, \$1,793,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
21 Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),
22 \$2,088,000.

23 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-
24 lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba : Operational
2 facilities, \$5,730,000.

3 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
4 tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

5 Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
6 facilities (Tactical air navigation facilities), \$69,000.

7 Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
8 Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),
9 \$69,000.

10 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities at White Beach, \$504,000.

12 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Oper-
13 ational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-
14 ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

15 SUPPLY FACILITIES

16 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
17 \$1,550,000.

18 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
19 facilities, \$884,000.

20 Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
21 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000

22 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

23 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
24 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
25 \$904,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$898,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities, \$69,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, southern Japan: Operational facilities, housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$726,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$1,093,000.

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent

1 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
 2 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
 3 total amount of \$65,091,000.

4 SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
 5 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-
 6 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

7 Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES",
 8 with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000"
 9 and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

10 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
 11 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-
 12 397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

13 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
 14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of
 15 section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,-
 16 000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in
 17 place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and
 18 "\$266,927,000".

19 SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
 20 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
 21 UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with
 23 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Cali-
 24 fornia, strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof
 25 "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station,

1 El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in
 2 place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the Naval
 3 Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and
 4 insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-
 7 358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

8 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 9 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
 10 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-
 11 807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,-
 12 555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

13 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 14 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
 15 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

16 (1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,
 17 with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Cali-
 18 fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof
 19 “\$1,099,000”.

20 (2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
 21 with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out
 22 “\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.

23 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 24 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
 25 Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out “\$3,686,-

1 000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with
2 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia,
3 Louisiana, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place
4 thereof "\$26,871,000".

5 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
6 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
7 Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000"
8 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
9 the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
10 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
11 and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,
12 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
13 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

14 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
15 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
16 Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,-
17 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

18 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
19 with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,
20 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
21 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval
22 Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out
23 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

24 (7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
25 TIES" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian

1 Head, Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place
2 thereof "\$879,000".

3 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
5 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

6 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
7 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajelein, Marshall
8 Islands, strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof
9 "\$5,235,000".

10 (2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILI-
11 TIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
12 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and
13 insert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

14 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
15 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,-
16 342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

17 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300",
20 "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting re-
21 spectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300",
22 "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

23 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
24 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
25 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

1 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
2 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-
3 lina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof
4 "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
5 Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in
6 place thereof "\$8,169,000".

7 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
8 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
9 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
10 623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
11 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$3,340,000".

13 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
14 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
15 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000"
16 and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

17 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
18 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
19 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
20 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

21 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
22 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
23 land, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$10,919,000".

25 (6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES",

1 ITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
2 San Francisco, California, strike out "\$2,029,000" and in-
3 sert in place thereof "\$3,779,000".

4 (7) Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
5 TIES", with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
6 Virginia, strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof
7 "\$500,000".

8 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
9 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES"
10 in section 201, as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES",
12 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
13 out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

14 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
15 amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and
16 inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

17 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
18 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
19 amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000",
20 and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place
21 thereof "\$303,453,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000",
22 and "\$451,393,000".

23 TITLE III

24 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
25 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-

ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

1 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
4 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

5 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
6 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

8 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
9 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
10 ground improvements, \$429,000.

11 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
13 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$905,000.

15 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
16 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
17 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
18 \$1,299,000.

19 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
21 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

22 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
23 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

24 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
3 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
4 ments, \$6,804,000.

5 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
6 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

8 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
9 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
10 and ground improvements, \$2,074,000.

11 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-
12 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
13 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
14 improvements, \$2,082,000.

15 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land ac-
16 quisition, \$136,000.

17 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
19 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
20 \$4,328,000.

21 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
22 Community facilities, \$244,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
24 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
25 ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

1 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
2 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
3 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

4 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

6 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply
7 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
8 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

9 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
10 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
11 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

12 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
13 utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real
14 estate improvements, \$1,128,000.

15 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

18 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
20 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
21 and ground improvements, \$2,909,000.

22 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
23 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$358,000.

25 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
2 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
3 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
4 sition, \$48,178,000.

5 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

6 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
7 housing, \$405,000.

8 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
10 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
11 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
12 and land acquisition, \$10,659,000.

13 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
14 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

15 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
16 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
17 \$899,000.

18 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
19 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

20 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
24 ments, \$5,133,000.

1 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
2 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

3 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
5 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
6 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

7 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:
8 Community facilities, \$56,000.

9 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
10 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop
11 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

12 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:
13 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
14 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
15 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
16 \$2,077,000.

17 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

18 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research
19 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
21 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test

1 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
2 provements, \$1,987,000.

3 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
4 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
5 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
6 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

7 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
8 Community facilities, \$206,000.

9 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
10 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
11 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

12 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
15 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
16 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

17 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
18 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
19 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
20 improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,962,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
23 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
24 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
25 and land acquisition, \$4,785,000.

1 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

3 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
5 \$489,000.

6 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
7 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

8 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
9 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
10 ties, \$2,209,000.

11 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
12 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
13 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

14 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
17 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

18 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

21 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
23 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

24 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
25 facilities, \$436,000.

1 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

3 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

6 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
8 \$5,909,000.

9 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Utilities and
10 ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate
11 improvements, \$653,000.

12 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
15 \$4,200,000.

16 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
17 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

18 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
20 \$1,977,000.

21 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements,
24 \$4,118,000.

25 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-

1 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$865,000.

3 AIR UNIVERSITY

4 Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land
5 acquisition, \$50,000.

6 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

7 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical
8 facilities, \$952,000.

9 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

11 Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-
12 ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
13 \$337,000.

14 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

15 Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,
16 Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

17 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
18 Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

19 Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-
20 lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$2,216,000.

22 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$2,089,000.

25 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

1 Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
2 and land acquisition, \$496,000.

3 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

4 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
5 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
6 facilities, \$848,000.

7 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
10 \$3,344,000.

11 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
13 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

15 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
16 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
17 facilities, \$1,487,000.

18 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$5,557,000.

21 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
22 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
23 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
24 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

25 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$9,584,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground
9 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
10 ments, \$2,976,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

24 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
25 and training facilities, \$250,000.

1 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
2 acquisition, \$37,000.

3 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

6 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
8 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

9 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
11 ground improvements, \$936,000.

12 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
13 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

15 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

17 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
18 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

20 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

24 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:

1 Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$231,000.

3 Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-
4 shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

6 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
8 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
9 \$3,892,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,528,000.

14 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

17 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

21 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
22 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$1,901,000.

25 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-

1 ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$235,000.

3 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

4 Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance
5 nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
6 munity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
7 acquisition, \$2,149,000.

8 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
9 Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community
10 munity facilities, \$1,287,000.

11 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop
12 housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,-
13 558,000.

14 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
15 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
16 \$760,000.

17 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply
18 facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

19 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

21 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
22 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
23 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
24 \$1,204,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
2 facilities, \$745,000.

3 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
6 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
7 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,558,000.

8 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
9 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

10 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$2,035,000.

12 SPECIAL FACILITIES

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 \$229,000.

15 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

23 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
24 ties, \$430,000.

25 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training

1 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$4,742,000.

3 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
4 \$350,000.

5 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

6 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
7 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
8 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
9 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisi-
10 tion, \$11,500,000.

11 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

12 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
13 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

14 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

15 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
16 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

17 FAR EAST AIR FORCES

18 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational
19 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
20 ties, \$2,642,000.

21 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
22 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$12,738,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$59,613,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$39,217,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$70,000,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof

1 “\$12,686,000”; and strike out “\$1,463,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$2,756,000”.

3 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
4 MAND”—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
5 stead, New York, strike out “\$729,000” and insert in place
6 thereof “\$929,000”; and strike out “\$686,000” and insert
7 in place thereof “\$886,000”.

8 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
9 COMMAND”—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
10 Muroc, California, strike out “\$27,478,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$29,442,000”; and strike out “\$16,192,000”
12 and insert in place thereof “\$18,156,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
15 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
16 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
17 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

18 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

21 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

22 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
23 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

25 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-

kota, strike out “\$7,709,000” and insert in place thereof “\$9,220,000”;

(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,029,000 and insert in place thereof “\$2,195,000”;

(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out “\$6,603,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,268,000”;

(5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, California, strike out “\$2,445,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,935,000”;

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out “\$5,526,000” and insert in place thereof “\$6,445,000”;

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out “\$742,000” and insert in place thereof “\$893,000”;

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Arizona, strike out “\$2,107,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,676,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama, strike out “\$4,170,000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,728,000”;

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,

1 New York, strike out "\$15,803,000" and insert in
2 place thereof "\$16,654,000";

3 (3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,
4 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$9,522,000" and
5 insert in place thereof "\$11,970,000";

6 (4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force
7 Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$12,001,000" and
8 insert in place thereof "\$14,508,000".

9 Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

10 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
11 Houston, Texas, strike out "\$3,438,000" and insert
12 in place thereof "\$3,876,000";

13 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
14 San Angelo, Texas, strike out "\$4,081,000" and insert
15 in place thereof "\$5,088,000";

16 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
17 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out "\$500,000 and insert
18 in place thereof "\$545,000";

19 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
20 Harlingen, Texas, strike out "\$446,000" and insert
21 in place thereof "\$529,000";

22 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
23 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$883,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$1,129,000";

25 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,

1 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and
2 insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

3 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
4 bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in
5 place thereof "\$1,304,000";

6 (8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base,
7 Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert
8 in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

9 Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—
10 with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, Dis-
11 trict of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place
12 thereof "\$825,000".

13 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
14 COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force
15 Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada,
16 strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,-
17 500".

18 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

19 (1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort
20 Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in
21 place thereof "\$7,363,000".

22 (2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor,
23 Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place
24 thereof "\$12,218,000";

25 (3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fair-

1 field, California, strike out “\$9,769,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$11,473,000”;

3 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
4 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
5 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

6 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

7 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
8 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
9 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

10 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
11 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$611,000”;

13 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
14 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
15 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

16 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
17 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

19 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
20 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

22 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
23 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
24 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

25 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—

1 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

3 Under the subheading “AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL
4 AIDS”—with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,-
5 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

6 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
8 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
9 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$824,-
10 300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”, re-
11 spectively.

12 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
13 is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED
14 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

15 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

16 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
17 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert in
18 place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

19 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
20 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

22 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
23 gow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert in
24 place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

25 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,

1 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
2 and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

3 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
4 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-
5 sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;

6 (6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
7 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;

9 (7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
10 port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;

12 (8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
13 North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in
14 place thereof “\$27,035,000”;

15 (9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
16 port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”
17 and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;

18 (10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
19 Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-
20 sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;

21 (11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
22 Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert
23 in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;

24 (12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-

consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,726,000”;

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out “\$3,278,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,808,000”;

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out “\$21,510,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,201,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out “\$17,966,000” and insert in place thereof “\$22,005,000”;

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out “\$473,000” and insert in place thereof “\$745,000”;

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof “\$251,000”;

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out “\$5,990,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,763,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out “\$17,121,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,471,000”;

1 (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,
2 Alabama, strike out “\$18,000” and insert in place
3 thereof “\$22,000”;

4 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
5 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out “\$24,433,000” and
6 insert in place thereof “\$33,858,000”;

7 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
8 Nevada, strike out “\$2,221,000” and insert in place
9 thereof “\$3,063,000”;

10 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
11 Oklahoma, strike out “\$977,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$1,064,000”.

13 Under the subheading “AIR UNIVERSITY”—with respect
14 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
15 out “\$215,000” and insert in place thereof “\$311,000”.

16 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
17 MAND”—

18 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
19 ville, California, strike out “\$13,395,000” and insert
20 in place thereof “\$15,993,000”;

21 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
22 etta, Georgia, strike out “\$345,000” and insert in place
23 thereof, “\$500,000”.

24 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
25 COMMAND”—

1 (1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field,
2 Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out “\$6,939,000” and
3 insert in place thereof “\$7,530,000”;

4 (2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
5 Muroc, California, strike out “\$5,488,000” and insert
6 in place thereof “\$7,220,000”.

7 Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

8 (1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso,
9 Texas, strike out “\$922,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$1,190,000”;

11 (2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced,
12 California, strike out “\$2,179,000” and insert in place
13 thereof “\$2,643,000”;

14 (3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base,
15 Columbus, Mississippi, strike out “\$14,518,000” and
16 insert in place thereof “\$15,322,000”;

17 (4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base,
18 Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out “\$943,000” and
19 insert in place thereof “\$1,075,000”;

20 (5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base,
21 Homestead, Florida, strike out “\$1,694,000” and insert
22 in place thereof “\$1,966,000”;

23 (6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base,
24 Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in
25 place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

1 (7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,
2 Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$1,236,000" and
3 insert in place thereof "\$1,586,000";

4 (8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
5 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$2,064,000"
6 and insert in place thereof "\$2,607,000";

7 (9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
8 Nebraska, strike out "\$5,697,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$6,155,000";

10 (10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,
11 Plattsburgh, New York, strike out "\$1,491,000" and
12 insert in place thereof "\$2,027,000";

13 (11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
14 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$661,000"
15 and insert in place thereof "\$720,000";

16 (12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,
17 Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$2,791,000" and
18 insert in place thereof "\$3,181,000".

19 Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—
20 with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-
21 ginia, strike out "\$2,613,000" and insert in place thereof
22 "\$2,785,000".

23 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
24 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED
25 STATES" as follows:

1 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—
2 with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
5 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
6 amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,-
7 934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000",
8 "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

9 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
10 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
11 read as follows:

12 "(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
13 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
14 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
15 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
16 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
17 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
18 in the next military construction authorization Act would
19 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
20 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
21 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
22 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
23 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
24 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
25 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the

1 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon
2 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
3 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
4 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.”

5 TITLE IV

6 GENERAL PROVISIONS

7 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
8 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
9 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
10 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
11 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.
12 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
13 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
14 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.
15 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
16 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
17 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.
18 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
19 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
20 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
21 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

22 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such
23 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
24 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
25 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

1 (1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$120,-
2 099,000; outside the United States, \$34,613,000; sec-
3 tion 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$297,714,000;

4 (2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$260,-
5 377,000; outside the United States, \$65,627,000; sec-
6 tion 202, \$65,091,000; or a total of \$391,095,000; and

7 (3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$437,-
8 357,000; outside the United States, \$225,407,000; sec-
9 tion 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$727,764,000.

10 SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or
11 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
12 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the
13 United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
14 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
15 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
16 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

17 SEC. 404. Whenever—

18 (1) the President determines that compliance with
19 section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for
20 contracts made under this Act for the establishment
21 or development of military installations and facilities in
22 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out
23 of this Act; and

24 (2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller

1 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
2 quately auditing those contracts;
3 the President may exempt those contracts from the require-
4 ments of that section.

5 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
6 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
7 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
8 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
9 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
10 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
11 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall
12 report semiannually to the Armed Services Committees of
13 the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to
14 all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to
15 the lowest responsible bidder.

16 SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
17 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary
18 of a military department in connection with the establish-
19 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
20 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
21 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and
22 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
23 tion are repealed, except—

24 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-

1 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
2 titles that contain the general provisions;

3 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
4 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
5 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
6 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

7 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
8 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
9 contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-
10 second Congress;

11 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
12 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
13 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
14 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

15 (5) the authorization for the development of the
16 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
17 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
18 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

19 (6) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
20 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
21 the authorization for (a) development of classified fa-
22 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
23 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
24 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified

1 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
2 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
3 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ; and

4 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
5 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
6 of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47) , as amended.

7 SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69
8 Stat. 324, 352) , as amended, is further amended to read
9 as follows:

10 "SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
11 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
12 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
13 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
14 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
15 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
16 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
17 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
18 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
19 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
20 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
21 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
22 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
23 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

24 SEC. 408. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
25 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-

ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

1 SEC. 410. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
2 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
3 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

4 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
5 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
6 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
7 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
8 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
9 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
10 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
11 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
12 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
13 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
14 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
15 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
16 acquisition.”

17 SEC. 411. Prior to the termination of, or reduction in
18 the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity
19 being conducted on the date of enactment of this Act within
20 any of the forty-eight States or the District of Columbia
21 (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such
22 termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the
23 supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished by
24 other than civilian employees of the United States, and
25 where such activity has been conducted for five or more

1 years and requires the services of ten or more civilian em-
2 ployees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the Presi-
3 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
4 sentatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed
5 termination or reduction. Such proposed termination or
6 reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of sixty
7 days of continuous session of the Congress following the
8 filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during
9 such sixty days either House of the Congress has adopted
10 a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed
11 termination or reduction described in such report. For the
12 purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be con-
13 sidered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the
14 computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded
15 the days on which either House is not in session because of
16 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

17 SEC. 412. The authority granted by section 2304 (a)
18 (1), title 10, United States Code, shall not be exercised
19 during the national emergency declared by the President on
20 December 16, 1950, except with respect to—

21 (1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of
22 which does not involve more than \$2,500;

23 (2) purchases or contracts for nonperishable sub-
24 sistence supplies;

25 (3) purchases or contracts for property or services

1 for experimental, developmental, or research work, or
2 making or furnishing property for experiment, test,
3 development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000.

4 (4) when in furtherance of small business, labor
5 surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency
6 head determines that supplies or services are to be pro-
7 cured from small business concerns, from concerns which
8 will perform the contracts substantially within labor
9 surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor,
10 or from concerns which will perform the contracts sub-
11 stantially within areas of major disaster.

12 SEC. 413. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
13 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the
14 Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August
15 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing
16 shall be available for the construction of family housing at
17 any installations for which family housing is authorized to
18 be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

19 SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
20 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out
21 in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and insert-
22 ing in place thereof the figure "\$147,341,000".

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

[Report No. 638]

A BILL

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON

JUNE 19, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

JUNE 26, 1957

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 3, 1957
For actions of July 2, 1957
85th-1st, No. 115

CONTENTS

Accounting.....9	Food supplies.....6	Personnel.....16,39,43
Adjournment.....11,22	Foreign aid....10,35,30,40	Plant pests.....27
Appropriations.....14,42	Forestry.....19,27	Postal rates.....20
Atomic energy.....18	Income data.....29	Poultry.....26
Census.....29	Industrial uses.....31	Price supports.....8,26
CCC Grain.....6	Information.....39	Procurement.....30
Civil defense.....4	Insecticides.....37	Public Law 480.....1,3
Committees.....32	Lands.....38	Reclamation.....15,24,41
Commodities.....35	Legislative program....22	Records.....7
Cooperatives.....36	Marketing.....34	Soil bank.....17,18
Corn.....23	Military construction....3	Statehood.....25
Electrification.5,18,24,41	Motor carriers.....22	Surplus disposal.....1
Farm program.....8,28	Nominations.....13	Trade, foreign.....1
Fiscal policy.....21	Organization.....2	Wheat.....17
Flood control.....32	Peanuts.....12	Wildlife.....37

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to bill to delete certain peanut picker statistical reports. Senate received nomination of Paarlberg to be Assistant Secretary. Conferees agreed to file report on bill to extend Public Law 480. House Rules Committee cleared bill to extend Reorganization Act.

HOUSE

1. SURPLUS DISPOSAL; FOREIGN TRADE. The conferees agreed to file a conference report on S. 1314, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). p. D611
2. ORGANIZATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 8364, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so as to make the Act applicable to reorganization plans transmitted to Congress at any time before June 1, 1959. p. 9693
3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including a provision for the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries. p. 9693
4. CIVIL DEFENSE. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported H.R. 7576, to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 so as to provide for contributions to the States for certain civil defense purposes. p. D610

5. ELECTRIFICATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommended to the full Committee that H.R. 5, to authorize the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam, not be reported. p. D610
6. CCC GRAIN. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee considered and tabled H.R. 6959, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the augmentation of natural food supplies for migratory waterfowl by requisitioning grain from CCC for supplying such agencies to feed such waterfowl. p. D611
7. PUBLIC RECORDS. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 7915, to require the consent of the Attorney General to produce certain public records in any civil or criminal proceeding. p. D610
8. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. McGovern criticized certain statements made by Rep. Berry concerning responsibility for the level of price supports for agricultural commodities. p. 9679
9. ACCOUNTING. Passed with amendment S. 1799, to facilitate the payment of Government checks, after substituting the language of a similar bill, H.R. 8195, which passed the House on July 1. p. 9680
10. FOREIGN AID. Received from the Director of ICA an interim report on major changes in the mutual security program as required by Public Law 665, 85th Congress. p. 9693
11. ADJOURNED until Fri., July 5. No business is to be transacted on Fri. and the House will adjourn over to Mon., July 8. pp. 9680, 9693

SENATE

12. PEANUTS. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 609, to delete certain reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines. (p. 9764) This bill will now be sent to the President.
13. NOMINATIONS. Received the nomination of Don Paarlberg to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Foreign Agriculture. p. 9771
14. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 7665, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1958. Conferees were appointed. pp. 9709, 9733-64
15. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 977, to suspend and modify the application of the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to lands in the East Bench unit, Missouri River Basin project (S. Rept. 574). p. 9698
16. PERSONNEL. Sen. Morton urged enactment of S. 2317, to establish a commission to study the compensation of Federal employees, pointing to the value of the Cordiner Committee's report. p. 9701
17. WHEAT; SOIL BANK. Sen. Neuberger expressed his misgivings about the soil bank program, urged a two price plan for wheat instead, and inserted an article "Soil Bank Proves Costly in Wheat." pp. 9770-1

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 8240

JULY 2, 1957.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 309]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 309, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 86

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 309

[Report No. 680]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 2, 1957

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution
2 it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself
3 into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8240) to
5 authorize certain construction at military installations, and
6 for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill
7 are hereby waived, except that it shall be in order to make
8 a point of order against section 411. After general debate,
9 which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed
10 two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chair-
11 man and ranking minority member of the Committee on
12 Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under

1 the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the considera-
 2 tion of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and
 3 report the bill to the House with such amendments as may
 4 have been adopted, and the previous question shall be con-
 5 sidered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to
 6 final passage without intervening motion except one motion
 7 to recommit.

85TH CONGRESS
 1ST SESSION

H. RES. 309

House Calendar No. 86

[Report No. 680]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 8240,
 a bill to authorize certain construction at
 military installations, and for other pur-
 poses.

By Mr. BOLLING

JULY 2, 1957

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
 printed

July 8, 1957

20. **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.** Concluded general debate on H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including a provision for the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries. pp. 9925-50
21. **FARM PROGRAM.** Rep. Berry defended his farm views against recent criticism by Rep. McGovern, and expressed his support for continuation of price supports for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. pp. 9951-52
22. **APPROPRIATIONS.** At the request of Rep. Whitten the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill (H.R. 7441), which was printed in the July 5 Congressional Record, was reprinted to correct the omission of a few lines of the terminology in the July 5 print. (pp. 9922-23) Material in Digest 117, July 5, relating to the conference report, is correct as printed.
Conferees were appointed on H.R. 7665, the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1958. (p. 9951) Senate conferees were appointed July 2.
23. **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.** Rep. Albert announced that the conference report on H.R. 7441, the agricultural appropriation bill for 1958 will be considered today, July 9. p. 9951

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. **WATER PROGRAM.** Sen. Johnson stated that the recent series of disastrous floods has pointed out the need for a long-range water program and inserted an editorial, "Nation's Growing Water Problem." pp. A5368-9
25. **FOREIGN AID.** Sen. Humphrey inserted an article commenting on foreign aid programs and stating that "our money is not going to save us, or the world, or the peace." p. A5370
Sen. Morse inserted an article on foreign aid which states that "in the current national debate, no one has asked the basic question of foreign aid: Has it, on balance, improved the chances of world peace?" pp. A5396-7
26. **FARM PROGRAM.** Sen. Johnson inserted an editorial, "Conserve Industry," and stated "this newspaper...appealed to its readers to place on the agricultural industry the value it deserves." p. A5373
27. **EDUCATION.** Sen. Fulbright inserted two letters from individuals who have participated in the International Educational Exchange Program. pp. A5374-5
28. **LIVESTOCK.** Sen. O'Mahoney inserted 3 telegrams endorsing S. 1356, to restore to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction in the enforcement of the anti-trust laws in the meat packing industry. p. A5380
29. **PURCHASING.** Extension of remarks of Rep. McCormack discussing the "numerous examples of waste, overlapping, duplication, and inefficiency" in procurement and other supply and service activities in the Department of Defense. pp. A5381-3
30. **FOOD ADDITIVES.** Rep. Burdick inserted an editorial, "You are Science's New Guinea Pig," warning of a definite hazard to public health through the use of untested chemical additives in foods. pp. A5399-400
31. **ELECTRIFICATION.** Rep. Berry inserted a letter he had prepared outlining the facts with relation to the history of the Hells Canyon legislation. pp. A5402-3

Rep. Ullman inserted an editorial, "Hells Canyon Dam Legislation-- Sherman Adams Seen Trying to Kill Issue in Congress to Avoid Presidential Veto." p. A5413

32. INFLATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell criticizing the administration's monetary policies and stating that the "tight money policy has failed to curb inflation and in fact has contributed to it." pp. A5414-5

BILLS INTRODUCED

33. WILDLIFE. S. 2489, by Sen. Neuberger, to require the use of humane methods of trapping animals and birds on lands and waterways under the jurisdiction of the United States; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author. p. 9842
S. 2496, by Sen. Watkins, to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," approved March 10, 1934, as amended, known as the Coordination Act; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9843-4
34. WEED CONTROL. S. 2490, by Sen. Humphrey, to provide for the control of noxious weeds on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9842-3
35. PERSONNEL. S. 2478, by Sen. Langer, to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
36. ACREAGE RESERVE. H.R. 8559, by Rep. Harden, to permit farmers in areas affected by excessive rainfall and flooded conditions to include acreage in the acreage reserve program up to August 15, 1957; to Agriculture Committee.
37. DEPRESSED AREAS. H.R. 8573, by Rep. Siler, to create a corporation to restore normal employment and produce industrial development in economically depressed areas; to Banking and Currency Committee.
38. APPROPRIATIONS. H. J. Res. 396, by Rep. Fulton, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to Judiciary Committee.
39. HOLIDAY. H. J. Res. 397, by Rep. Fulton, declaring Flag Day to be a legal holiday; to Judiciary Committee.
40. FARM-CITY WEEK. H. J. Res. 400, by Rep. Andresen, designating the week of November 22-28, 1957, as National Farm-City Week; to Judiciary Committee.

- 0 -

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- July 9: Transfer of certain work under Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC, H. Agriculture (Butz to testify). Audit reports on emergency feed programs, S. Agriculture. Foreign aid appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec). Federal employee pay bills, H. Post Office and Civil Service.
- July 16: Barter transactions under Public Law 480, S. Agriculture (Berger, CSS, to testify).
- July 22, 23: Withholding information and availability of records, H. Government operations (Farrington, OGC, to testify).

the 80th Congress. At all times he was a useful, faithful, conscientious Congressman, loyal to his party, but before his party came his country, always. We will not soon see his like again.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in saying kind words about the great man with whom I served, Earl Michener, former Congressman from Michigan whose death was recently reported. As a freshman Congressman I received no finer instruction, assistance and advice than I received from Congressman Michener. At that time he was chairman of the Republican Conference, but he was not partisan. He was always broadminded. Whenever we had a problem of any kind I felt there was no one to whom I could talk, and who would give me the best possible assistance than Earl Michener. It was a great loss to this House when he decided to retire.

I am sure this House has never had a more conscientious, more diligent, more hard-working Congressman than Earl Michener. It is a sad day for each of us when we must say farewell to dear friends who have been of assistance to us in days gone. He was truly a great American.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of Earl Michener. He was one of the great parliamentarians of the House of Representatives. He had an analytical mind and I never knew of anyone who could better analyze legislation so as to make it more understandable.

Earl Michener was a great help to new Members.

I recall how helpful he was to me when I first came to the House of Representatives. I always admired him for his honesty and his integrity and his great ability as a legislator.

In behalf of the Republican Conference, and I am sure I also speak for the entire membership of the House, let me say that we all deeply regret the passing of this great American.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Congressman Earl Michener I feel that I have lost a great personal friend. As I recall this friend and colleague, the one characteristic which stands out in my mind is the great respect that he had for the House of Representatives. He consistently reminded the Members of their duties and obligations and pointed out the decorum that should prevail in the House so that the people of this country of ours would properly respect the greatest legislative

body in the world. He was a fine example of the highest type of statesmanship and his influence will long prevail.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, while it was not my privilege to know Earl Michener except by reputation, that reputation entitles him to highest honor for the great service he rendered to the Congress, the Nation, and the State of Michigan. I take this opportunity to express, in common with my colleagues in the House who served with Earl Michener from the State of Michigan, my deep regret at his passing, and to join in tribute to him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Earl Michener our country has lost one of the most capable legislators I have ever served with or known. Earl was a gentleman of the best type. He truly served his day and generation. He had a spotless soul.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and accomplishments of Earl C. Michener.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Earl Michener is indeed sad news, especially to those of us who had the privilege of knowing him when he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

He was a man of great talent, modest and retiring, and in his quiet and friendly way commanded the respect and affection of all who came in contact with him. He took his job as a Congressman seriously and devoted his entire time and efforts to the responsibilities which were his. He was a distinguished lawyer in his own right and I have heard other members of the bar speak of his wisdom and his legal knowledge in terms of the highest respect and praise. He was especially kind and thoughtful to new Members of Congress as they came here and explained to them the rules and regulations under which we operate.

He always spoke well of people and was ready to listen to the other side of any argument and although he might not agree with you, when he so expressed himself it was with the greatest courtesy and in a spirit of warmth and friendship. It was a real privilege to know him and his wide circle of friends has suffered a severe loss.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with deep regret of the passing of Earl Michener.

He and I were close friends for many years during his service here in the House.

He was loved and admired on both sides of the aisle.

He made a fine contribution in life to his community, to his State, and to the Nation.

He served in the Army throughout the Spanish-American War. He served as a Member of the Congress for a full 30 years.

Those who served with him here will recall his outstanding ability as a legislator and as a parliamentarian, and his efficiency as a member and chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and as a member of the powerful Rules Committee.

He retired after the 81st Congress because of the illness of his wife—who has also just died, only a few days before him.

I join in extending heartfelt sympathy to his daughter and to all those close to him.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 129 I am recorded as not responding to my name. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 6127, known as the civil rights' bill, as it passed the House, contained an amendment, one amendment, which should have been printed on page 13 where it was adopted. By inadvertence an error was made in the Journal and in the printing of the bill, and the bill was printed so that the amendment appears at the bottom of page 8 of the bill instead of as a new section on page 13. It was so messaged to the other body in the erroneous form. In other words, the House sent to the other body a bill which is not in conformity with the action of the House. The bill was received by the other body and was read the first time and was then read the second time and it is now on the calendar of the other body. My parliamentary inquiry is whether it is not the proper procedure at this time to ask the other body to return the bill to the House for action to conform to what actually took place and to conform with the RECORD and the Journal of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Virginia to withhold his inquiry for the purpose of enabling the Chair to look further into the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the Speaker.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 309) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8240, a bill to authorize certain construction at mili-

tary installations, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived, except that it shall be in order to make a point of order against section 411. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 provides for the consideration of H. R. 8240, authorizing construction for the military departments. The resolution provides for an open rule, 2 hours of general debate on the bill, and waives points of order against the bill, except for section 411.

The bill carries a total authorization of \$1,676,662,000. Of this amount \$297,714,000 is for the Army; and \$391,095,000 is authorized for the Navy. Only one new activity is scheduled for the Navy and that is an air facility for the Naval Academy. The Air Force is authorized \$727,764,000.

One hundred and eighty six million four hundred and ninety-nine thousand dollars of the total represents increases in prior authorities, \$21,341,000 is authorized for the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, and \$52,209,000 is authorized for 2,214 family housing units.

Some new provisions appear in the bill. The military departments are required to report twice yearly to the Congress on contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Unused authorities will be rescinded after a period of 4 years rather than 5, as now provided.

The authority for leasing of housing at tactical installations is extended for 1 more year, and 5,000 units are authorized.

Section 411 provides that prior to the termination or reduction in the operations of any commercial or industrial type activity which has been conducted for 5 or more years and requires the services of 10 or more civilian employees of the United States, the Secretary of Defense shall file a report with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House setting forth the details of the proposed termination or reduction. The section also provides that such termination or reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of 60 days of

continuous session of Congress, and shall not take effect then if either House of Congress adopts a resolution which disapproves such termination or reduction. The Rules Committee provided that no points of order would be waived on this section so the House may have an opportunity to work its will on this controversial matter.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 309 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 8240.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] has explained, House Resolution 309 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 8240, the so-called military construction bill. It carries approximately \$1,700,000,000 in new authorizations for military construction of different types and kinds, both in the continental United States, in our possessions, and abroad. It is the authorization bills, of course, which pave the way, as we all know, for future appropriations. Of course this is a highly technical bill. Perhaps only the membership of the Armed Services Committee know, of their own knowledge, the need for these different installations and for construction of the different facilities as set forth in the bill.

However, the measure also carries some other provisions, which I think are very important, in addition to the authorization for appropriations. It carries one provision that is very important, in connection with the letting of contracts by the Armed Services and their different branches. In my opinion, as I heard the testimony given before the Committee on Rules, that particular provision is good, and one which should be of benefit to and give protection for the people of the United States and their tax funds.

Another section in this bill, however, section 411, is somewhat questionable, in my mind. Whether or not it is the part of wisdom to adopt such a particular provision into our law, is indeed doubtful. For that reason the Rules Committee saw fit, with the consent, I may add, of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to grant a rather peculiar rule which waives points of order on the bill, except as to section 411.

Section 411 would handicap, to a great extent, if not almost prevent entirely, the Secretary of Defense and other National Defense officials from eliminating many, if any, of the present business activities of the Defense Department which are in competition with private enterprise, unless and until Congress first gives its consent. I understand that perhaps a point of order may be made against section 411. I cannot pass on the parliamentary question as to whether such a point of order will prevail or will be overruled. But if section 411 remains in the bill, it is my understanding that there will be amendments offered to strike it from the measure.

I have made this explanation, Mr. Speaker, with the thought that my words may alert the membership of the House as to that particular situation, because I think it is one that must be debated

and should be discussed rather fully on the floor.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I, therefore, yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 132]

Abbltt	Dingell	Morrow
Adair	Dixon	Miller, N. Y.
Alexander	Dollinger	Minshall
Alger	Donohue	Moore
Andersen,	Dorn, N. Y.	Morano
H. Carl	Eberharter	Morgan
Anderson,	Fallon	Morrison
Mont.	Fino	Moulder
Anfuso	Flood	Multer
Ashmore	Fogarty	Mumma
Barden	Forand	O'Konski
Barrett	Frazier	O'Neill
Bass, N. H.	Fulton	Osmer
Baumhart	Gary	Philbin
Beamer	Gordon	Polk
Belcher	Granahan	Powell
Bentley	Green, Pa.	Prouty
Blitch	Gregory	Rains
Boggs	Griffiths	Riehlman
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Robeson, Va.
Bosch	Healey	Rodino
Bowler	Hess	Rogers, Mass.
Boyle	Holtzman	Roosevelt
Brown, Mo.	Ikard	Santangelo
Brownson	James	Seely-Brown
Buckley	Jennings	Sieminski
Byrne, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Staggers
Byrne, Pa.	Kearns	Stauffer
Canfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Taylor
Chelf	Kilburn	Teller
Chiperfield	Kluczynski	Tewes
Christopher	Latham	Thompson, La.
Chudoff	Lennon	Thomson, Wyo.
Clark	Long	Thornberry
Coad	McCarthy	Tuck
Coffin	McConnell	Udall
Colmer	McCormack	Vanik
Cooley	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Coudert	McMillan	Vorys
Cunningham,	Macdonald	Watts
Nebr.	Machrowicz	Willis
Curtis, Mass.	Madden	Wilson, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Magnuson	Wilson, Ind.
Dawson, Ill.	Maillard	Yates
Dennison	Martin	Zelenko
Diggs	Meador	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 292 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8240, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 18 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is known as the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1958.

Now, under the bill the following amounts will be granted the three services:

Army	\$297,714,000
Navy	391,095,000
Air Force	727,764,000
Total	1,416,573,000

In addition to this authorization, \$186,495,000 is authorized to correct deficiencies in authorizations of projects authorized under previous laws. This \$186 million is broken down as follows:

Army	\$28,885,000
Navy	42,648,000
Air Force	114,962,000
Total	186,495,000

Now, these 2 items amount to \$1,603,072,000.

To this amount, we must add \$21,341,000 for the Air Academy.

So, the correct total of authorization carried in this bill is \$1,624,413,000.

There are over 400 named installations in this bill and about 4,000 individual line items.

When the program contained in this bill was being formulated in the first instance, the request from the field offices totalled over \$5.5 billion.

As a result of careful surveys, the military departments reduced this amount down to \$3.6 billion.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense, after a detailed study, further reduced it down to the amount of \$1,742,394,000 which was submitted to the committee.

Now, I would like to talk briefly as to the extent to which the committee cut the bill, and I might say, that the committee made its cuts after 4 weeks of hearings in a most detailed study of the bill.

In the first place, the committee eliminated a little over \$139 million from authorizations in titles I, II, and III. However, since the committee, for legislative purposes, moved the authority for the Air Force Academy from title III to the general provisions, the true cut is about \$118 million. This is made up of two principal elements: \$66 million in specific line item cuts in titles I, II, and III and \$52 million in general housing authority.

This latter cut was done in this fashion: The departments already have on the books a large amount of authority to construct housing with appropriated funds—the reason for this excess au-

thority in housing is the fact that the Capehart program came along and it was decided by the executive branch to use private money to construct family housing instead of appropriated funds.

The committee felt that old authority should be used up and thereby cut down on the new authorization.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

Now, while we are on the subject of authorizations, I would like to draw your attention to page 3 of the report. There is set out there all the authorizations and appropriations which have been granted the three departments since 1948. This gives you the complete picture.

I would like to point out that at the time this bill was reported out, the appropriation request was \$1,900,000,000. Shortly after the bill was reported, the President lowered his budget request to \$1,665,500,000. For this reason, all of the appropriations figures set out in the table will change. I don't know, and I rather doubt whether anyone knows at this moment, exactly the way in which they will change. I would assume that the cuts which will result will be on a pro rata basis.

There is now, therefore, a total appropriation request of \$1,665,500,000 against a total authorization in this bill of \$1,676,000,000.

As you can see, this will leave unfunded authorization in the amount of a little over \$2 billion still outstanding. It has been my purpose and the purpose of the Armed Services Committee over the past several years to cut down the difference between authorizations and appropriations. I feel that the difference between them should be the minimum amount necessary for effective operation.

REPEAL OF OLD AUTHORITIES

A few years ago, we inserted a provision in the law which stated that any authorization over 5 years old was automatically repealed. This has worked quite well. However, feeling that this period could be cut even more, we inserted a provision in the bill this year which would automatically repeal all authorizations which are 4 years old. This is section 406 which begins on page 66 of the bill. At the time we put this provision in, we told the departments that next year we were going to move it down to 3 years. So, we are going to end up with only a minimum of difference between authorizations and appropriations.

DEFICIENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

At this point, I would like to speak about the deficiency authorization which you will find in each title of the bill. You will recall that I referred to those previously when giving the totals of each of the titles.

These deficiency authorizations are relatively new in military construction bills and reflect, for the most part, the steadily rising costs for construction. On page 30 of the report, the matter of deficiency authorizations is dealt with in some detail, but very briefly stated they are explained on two bases: First, poor

cost estimates in the first instance, and second, rises in cost.

It should be understood that some of these items were designed and estimated as much as 4 or 5 years ago. In those days, there was no "advanced planning" authority. The effect of this was that many of the costs were grossly inaccurate, since they were not based on precise planning or design.

The second reason—increase in cost—is illustrated by the fact that during the past 2½ years, there has been a rise in construction costs of 13.4 percent.

In the case of the Air Force, another element is involved and that is building heavier runways, in place of lighter ones originally planned, in order that the heavy bombers may have a greater latitude of dispersal.

One concluding thought on the matter of deficiency authorizations. The increased authority does not represent a bigger barracks, larger hangar, or a longer pier. The barracks, the hangar, and the pier will be the same as originally authorized but simply will cost more than the authority originally granted.

LAND

A word about land. The report on the bill deals in detail with the lands already held by the military departments and the land planned for acquisition in this bill. This you will find on pages 27 through 29 of the report. This gives the complete picture of the land situation. Briefly stated, this bill will authorize land acquisitions as follows:

They total approximately 39,215 acres in fee, with the Army contemplating 942; the Navy, 29,444; and the Air Force, 9,140. The total cost of these lands will be about \$15 million.

About 30,000 acres of easements also will be required, at a total cost of \$9.5 million.

This is a total land expenditure of \$24,639,000.

NEW BASES

I am always interested and I know you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this committee are always interested in whether a bill of this kind authorizes the establishment of any new base. At the bottom of page 26 of the report is set out a discussion of the new bases.

Actually, there is only one new base planned by this bill, and that is Towers Field, which will be a training field for the midshipmen of the Naval Academy. The bill would authorize \$3.2 million for land acquisition only for Towers Field.

I might say in this connection that there has been so much discussion and dissension about the establishment of this field that I appointed a subcommittee to look into the matter and keep tab on all matters relating to the location of the base. Personally, I feel that we should look very carefully at the possibility of using Andrews Air Force Base for this purpose.

BASIS OF THE PROGRAM

The construction program contained in this bill is, of course, based on the forces which we plan to have over the next several years. In the case of the Army, the program is based on 1 million

men. In the case of the Navy, the program represents the shore establishment necessary for 980 ships. For the Air Force, we are building toward 118 wings.

I would now like to review briefly the major elements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force titles of the bill. If you wish, you can follow this discussion by referring to page 4 of the report where the breakdown of the Army program starts.

ARMY

Now, the Army would be authorized \$297 million in this bill. This is about \$25 million less than last year.

(a) Forty-four million eight hundred thousand dollars, or 15 percent, is for troop and family housing.

(b) One hundred and fifteen million dollars, or 38.6 percent, is for construction of facilities for the tactical defense of key cities, bases, and industrial centers in the United States. This represents construction for Nike, Hercules, and other defense missiles.

(c) Twenty million eight hundred thousand dollars, or 7 percent, is for construction in support of Army aviation at 17 installations.

(d) Twenty million eight hundred thousand dollars, representing 7 percent, is for the line of communications in France.

(e) The balance of the program, \$68 million, or 22.8 percent, is for other essential construction of facilities, including \$28 million for classified facilities both in the United States and overseas.

The Army's program, broken down by categories, will be found at the top of page 5. This is followed by a detailed breakdown of the program by technical service and continental armies. In each instance the mission of the technical service and the continental army is set out, as is the geographical area covered by the Army.

NAVY

The Navy would get \$391 million under this bill.

Approximately 84 percent of the program, or \$329 million, is for piers, runways, shops, and other operational facilities.

Twelve percent, or \$46.6 million, is for barracks, bachelor officers quarters, messes, dispensaries, and other similar facilities.

About 3 percent, or \$9.9 million is for laboratories and similar research and development facilities.

The remaining 1 percent of the Navy's program, or \$5.7 million, is for the acquisition of fee and easement interests.

You will note that starting at the bottom of page 12 of the report, the program is further broken down into shipyard facilities, fleet base facilities, aviation facilities, and so forth. In each instance, the purpose of the particular type of facilities is set out, as is the money amount and considerable detail as to the particular items which will be built.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force would be authorized \$728 million under the bill.

You will find a breakdown by command on page 18 of the report. From that table, you will see that:

The Strategic Air Command gets \$163 million or over 22 percent of the total.

The Air Defense Command is next with \$107 million or almost 15 percent of the total.

The Air Training Command and the Air Materiel Command gets approximately the same amount—a little over 6 percent each.

Outside the United States, the Aircraft Control and Warning System receives the largest amount with \$70 million which represents over 9 percent of the total. The Strategic Air Command is next with \$64 million which is almost 9 percent of the total. The rest of the overseas construction follows those two items.

I might point out that \$137,782,000 represents airfield payments alone.

In the material following the table which I have just referred to, you will find the various commands dealt with in detail. Not only is the amount of money set out but also the general areas of use to which the money will be put. And in each instance, the mission of the particular command is described.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provision are for the most part similar to those which have appeared in previous years. They begin on page 64 of the bill and are described in the report starting on page 33.

Sections 401 through 405 are the same as they have been in previous years. They do not grant any new authority but merely set out totals in the bill, provide for 5 and 10 percent variations in the cost of projects, and other things of this nature.

Section 405 is essentially the same as in previous years. It provides that contracts for construction authorized by this act will go to the lowest responsible bidders under virtually all circumstances. The military departments have a fine record on the basis of obtaining their construction through competitive bidding in that about 93 percent of all their contracts are awarded in this fashion.

The difference in section 405 appears as the second sentence of that section. You will note on page 66, starting on line 11, that semiannually the military departments will report to the Armed Services Committees with respect to any contracts which are let on a negotiated basis. Although there are very few of them, the committee felt that it should keep itself informed with respect to those instances where the contract is not let on a competitive-bid basis.

Section 406 is the section I referred to previously as the one rescinding authorities which have been in existence for some years. The bill as originally submitted had that period as 5 years. The committee now has changed this to 4 years, and, as I stated before, will change it to 3 years when the next bill is before us.

Section 407 merely modifies last year's law so that housing may be leased at NIKE sites and thereby save the money which would otherwise be expended in building houses for the troops which must be stationed at these important locations.

Sections 408 and 409 relate to housing and, generally, grants some more space to enlisted men with large families.

Section 410 has appeared in previous laws and relates to the use of funds generated by the sale of surplus commodities in foreign countries for the construction of housing for our military.

Section 411: To give some of the history of the philosophy behind section 411, I will go back to section 638 of the Defense Appropriation Act approved July 13, 1955. That section provided that:

Sec. 638. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work that has been for a period of 3 years or more performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless justified to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, at least 90 days in advance of such disposal or transfer, that its discontinuance is economically sound and the work is capable of performance by a contractor without danger to the national security: *Provided*, That no such disposal or transfer shall be made if disapproved by either committee within the 90-day period by written notice to the Secretary of Defense.

This section, of course, provided that the Appropriations Committees would make the determination with respect to the disposal or transfer of the activity.

In May 1956 the appropriations bill was reported with language identical to section 638 and appeared this time as section 633.

Mr. ALLEN offered an amendment to strike section 633. There was a rollcall vote on the Allen amendment and the House approved his amendment by a vote of 222 yeas and 156 nays, a majority of 66 votes.

Later on that year, the Armed Services Committee reported its point-of-order bill, H. R. 7992. It contained a section 27 (a) which was substantially the same as section 411 of the bill we are now discussing. It read in part as follows:

SEC. 27. (a) Prior to the transfer by contract of any commercial or industrial-type operation which has been performed by the Department of Defense for a period of 3 consecutive years or more and in which more than 10 civilian personnel are employed at the specific activity concerned, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House a report setting forth the details of the proposed transfer. Upon the expiration of 60 days of continuous session of the Congress following the filing of said report, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to proceed with the proposed transfer unless during such period either House shall adopt a resolution of disapproval, as hereinafter provided in this section, of the proposed transfer described in said report. For the purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by adjournment of the Congress sine die; but in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

That section 27 (a) appeared in the point-of-order bill as a committee amendment and a separate vote on that amendment was demanded. The amendment prevailed by a vote of 201 to 185, a majority of 16 votes.

So, the House has previously indicated its approval of a provision virtually identical to this section 411.

Now, that brings us up to date for the consideration of section 411 of this bill

which, as I say, is almost identical to section 27 (a) in the point-of-order bill.

Section 412: This is a new section and is designed to get the Department of Defense back in the business of doing their procurement on open competitive bids and not by negotiation.

The section provides that the national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, may not be used in the field of procurement as a basis for negotiation with four exceptions. The exceptions are contracts that do not involve more than \$2,500; contracts for nonperishable subsistence supplies; research and development contracts not exceeding \$100,000; and lastly, in connection with programs in furtherance of small business, labor surplus areas, and major disaster areas.

On page 34 of the report are some of the figures which the Armed Services Committee has obtained indicating the extent to which the departments have been performing their procurement through negotiation. You will see that funds spent by the Department of Defense under the authority of the Korean emergency proclamation of December 16, 1950, constituted over 94 percent of all Defense Department funds.

During a 9 month period in 1956, and notwithstanding corrective action which was supposed to have been taken by the Department, \$5.3 billion was contracted for using the same emergency proclamation. This represented 38.94 percent of Department of Defense dollars.

Section 413 simply permits old housing authority to be used for the construction of the houses authorized in this act. This will cut down on old authorizations.

Section 414 raised the basic authorization for construction at the Air Force Academy from \$126 million to \$147 million.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have a tight bill which, you will recall, started at \$5½ billion and now ends up at \$1,624,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. There seems to be in this bill a little, or even more than a little in some instances, for every State, led by California with \$134 million.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is probably correct, except the State of West Virginia. West Virginia has an item in the bill, but it is classified, and it could not be dealt with in detail.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the State of Iowa almost went out the window with only \$284,000 out of a billion and a half.

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the gentleman that three is not one item in this bill for the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia, the district I have the privilege to serve.

Mr. GROSS. But, of course, the State of Georgia is in the bill to the tune of \$37 million.

Mr. VINSON. That is not my district.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman spoke of the effect of the declaration of emergency back in 1950. Does not the gen-

tleman agree with me that it is about time that we put an end to this whole emergency business?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. If declaring an end to the emergency will have an adverse effect on certain laws and programs that should be continued, let us face the problem and take it up in the usual way.

Mr. VINSON. I certainly agree with the gentleman; and the Kilday amendment, as far as the Department of Defense is concerned, will accomplish that. As the gentleman from Ohio said in explaining the rule, that is a very important section of the bill and will help close the door on negotiated contracts.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to place emphasis on the fact that this construction bill was reported out of the Armed Services Committee unanimously. I would like also to point out, however, that the committee was not unanimous with respect to one important element of the bill—and that is section 411. I will speak on this section somewhat later, when I move to strike said section from the bill.

The chairman of the committee has given an outline of the review to which this bill was subjected from the time of its original generation in the field offices of the military departments to the final product which we find in H. R. 8240.

A bill of this magnitude, containing as it does, over 400 named installations, and thousands of individual line items, is a difficult thing to grasp in its entirety without detailed study and consideration. Realizing this, the Armed Services Committee approached the bill from three principal directions. The first of these was to get the overall policy which lies behind the bill and this we received from witnesses from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Secondly, we required each of the military departments to break down their portion of the bill into what we called packages—and by this I mean how much was for barracks, how much was for Nike installations, how much was for airfield pavements, how much was for shipyard facilities, and so on?

The third approach was a detailed examination of the individual, specific line items which, in the last analysis, make up the whole bill.

It took us a month to do this and it is a hard, undramatic, unromantic job. But it is one we all know has to be done and has to be done well if we are to fulfill the responsibilities which we all have to our own constituents and to the whole country.

This bill contains authorities which will permit appropriations of \$1,676,000,000.

Although this represents a huge program, the committee found that this amount actually represented the final results of the screening and rescreening review procedures which were carried out on this program within the Department of Defense. We found that the original requests from the three military departments to the Department of

Defense amounted to \$3.6 billion. After extensive review by the Secretary of Defense, this original request was reduced by over 40 percent down to a new total of \$2.1 billion.

However, as this amount of construction work exceeded the monetary limitations within the Department of Defense fiscal year 1958 budget, this program was further screened down to less than 50 percent of what the 3 departments had originally asked the Secretary of Defense to approve.

This was not the final reduction—when this program was examined by the Bureau of the Budget, before its submittal to Congress, it was decided that the Department of Defense fiscal year 1958 construction funds would be reduced by \$200 million. As a result, this program was finally cut down to \$1,742,000,000 which was the amount initially requested in H. R. 7130, the predecessor bill to H. R. 8240. This amounts to only 43 percent of what the 3 departments requested in the first place, and is indicative of the extremely rigid review to which this bill was submitted before it was received by Congress. This review has achieved, I believe, utmost economy consistent with strong defense.

The testimony which we have received has repeatedly demonstrated that the items which survived both the Department of Defense review and the Bureau of the Budget reduction, represent fully verified requirements which are genuinely needed to support the missions which have been assigned to our Armed Forces.

We also found that the review procedures used within the Department of Defense were extremely thorough, and that each and every project was individually examined from the standpoint of need, cost, design, size, location, and sound engineering principles.

We also found that only those facilities needed to support long-term use were being requested, and that requests for many projects had been postponed so that the maximum possible use could be made of old structures left over from World War II.

Therefore, it seems very evident that the projects comprising H. R. 8240 represent a very tight and closely scrutinized military construction program that merits prompt passage, with 1 exception, and that is section 411.

Section 411 would, simply stated, require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Speaker and the President of the Senate whenever he intended to close down a commercial or industrial-type activity. If either of the Houses objected to the closing of the facility, then it could pass a resolution and require the activity to be continued.

This, of course, is not the first time we have had this concept before us. The idea managed to survive an appropriations act a few years ago, but was soundly defeated the next year. In the point of order bill, it survived by a very close margin, but I think that the vote at that time was not a considered one and may well have reflected a lack of complete understanding on the part of the House as to the implications that are inherent in legislation of this kind.

Historically, and most fundamentally, our Government is divided into three elements. It is our tradition—and, indeed, our law—that one of the constituent elements should not interfere with the activities of another. Each has its job to do and must be allowed to do it without interference from the other.

Here we have the legislative branch of our Government dipping into the day-by-day activities of the executive branch. We select officials to run the executive branch in whom we have confidence. We pick them for their proven ability in their particular fields. We place great responsibility upon them. And we give them our full confidence.

But what would we do under this section 411? We would say "We know you have an important job to do; we have almost full confidence in you, but we think we ought to be able to lend a paternal hand to your daily operations. We think we know better how to run your business than you do."

If good business sense dictates that a commercial or industrial activity should be deactivated and get out of business—and this decision is made by a responsible official in the Department of Defense and is approved by the Secretary of Defense—who are we to say that his decision is wrong?

Full and free business activity is our tradition. The very foundation of our country's economy is based on a free economy; one with a minimum of Government interference—one with a minimum of Government activity in fields which are essentially of a business nature.

In a word, if we can buy it from a private producer, then we shouldn't be in the business of making it ourselves. This is subject, of course, to some minor exceptions, but by and large, the Government's business is government, not manufacturing.

Section 411 is bad legislation and bad policy.

With the same strong feeling of sincerity that I ask that the construction authorization be passed, I will later on ask that section 411 be defeated.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman has said that under section 411 the Congress is dipping into the responsibility of the Executive and that, if I understood the distinguished gentleman correctly, the people whom we have selected to run the executive department have willed that these installations be cut out, in the event such an installation is sought to be disestablished. Now, to begin with, the military quite frequently does not want these establishments discontinued. It is some civilian down in the Department that wants to do it who does not have the comprehensive information that the military man would have. The gentleman says that we dip into the operation of the executive branch. I wish the gentleman would make it plain to the House that the Constitution—and a lot of us still believe in it—says that the Congress shall provide an Army and a Navy and that the President shall be

Commander in Chief thereof. It does not say the Department of Justice; it does not say the Department of Commerce; it does not say the Department of the Interior, or some other department. It says the Congress shall provide a military. It does not single out any other department.

How can the gentleman say to the House that we are dipping into the Executive when the Constitution tells us to provide a military? How on earth can we do it if we do not know what is going on? So I respectfully submit to my distinguished friend that we are not dipping into the Executive. We are following our mandate when we provide a military. How can we provide a military with what they are entitled to have if somebody downtown takes this away, takes that away, and takes something else away, and gives it to some friend in industry?

Mr. ARENDS. If the gentleman from South Carolina will bide with me, when the motion is made to strike section 411 from the bill, I shall go into that in detail. I have some material that I should like to present at that time which I think will give the gentleman an answer to his question.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman will admit that the Constitution singles out the Congress to provide a military and the President to command it, and we have to provide that; the gentleman will agree with that?

Mr. ARENDS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How does this proposed authorization compare with spending for the same purpose last year? I do not seem to find that information in the report. Does this represent an increase or a decrease?

Mr. ARENDS. I think last year the amount was \$2,200,000,000. This provides some reduction. I should like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I know of no way we could have screened these requests any more closely, or given this proposal a more intelligent approach than we did. I recited the careful study made of each item resulting in reductions, and I think we have done a tremendously good job from the standpoint of how much economy we could bring into this proposal.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that it is proposed to withdraw a couple of divisions from Japan. If they are brought back are facilities adequate to take care of them without coming to Congress for additional construction?

Mr. ARENDS. I am sure there will be, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on page 17 of the report there is listed \$65 million of the total of the Air Force appropriation as classified. Yet on only three pages of the bill, dealing with Air Force installations, I find approximately \$217 million proposed to be expended at "various locations," without any further detail. Can the gentleman shed any light on this?

Mr. ARENDS. I think the gentleman will have to rely somewhat on the good judgment of the committee. We have some of this classified information, which we obtained in executive session, but for security reasons we cannot divulge it at this particular time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. To supplement what the gentleman has just said, the committee had full information on all of the expenditures for each of the classified projects referred to in the bill. We cannot come into the House, and we could not in the report go into detail on each of those. Had we done so, we would have had to reveal secret information. But I can assure the gentleman and the committee that the Armed Services Committee had an explanation of all of the classified projects.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield again, the only point I was making is that at one place the report lists \$65 million as being classified and yet the bill, only on three pages, shows \$217 million to be expended at various and completely unspecified locations. Nor is there information as to the purpose.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me repeat to the gentleman from Iowa that I think he must rely on the judgment of the Armed Services Committee in what we are trying to do in this particular bill without divulging where our security is involved exactly what is proposed.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman from Illinois has announced the intention of striking out section 411. The effect of section 411 is to prohibit the Defense Department from discontinuing any function, service, or manufacture of any item which the Defense Department feels can be provided to better advantage from private sources. It prevents them from discontinuing that service without prior consent of Congress. Can the gentleman cite a single instance, after his many years of experience and service on the Committee on Armed Services, where the Defense Department has been able to manufacture an item or to provide a service or promote a function at a cost less than it can obtain it from private sources?

Mr. ARENDS. Of course I cannot. We all know that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Getting back to the classified information, the gentleman from Ohio especially wants to thank the chairman and the entire membership of this committee for the courtesy and consideration shown him. There was a project that was determined classified. I am most happy to say that in my opinion there is one committee in Congress that does not allow the so-called brass or bureaucrats to tell them what to do. It has been proven to me beyond question

of a doubt that this particular committee determines itself what is classified and does not take the ruling of someone regardless of how high his rank may be. The gentleman from Ohio greatly appreciates the consideration shown him in connection with a project that we determined ourselves was not worth while. I thank the committee for recognizing that fact.

Mr. ARENDS. We thank the gentleman. With all modesty, I must say we do have an extraordinarily good committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Are there any provisions in this bill for the acquisition of large land areas for Port Chicago, Calif.?

Mr. ARENDS. No, not at all. I do not think we took that into consideration at all.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, nothing in the bill relates to that. It remains status quo.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In other words, they are going to spend \$723,000 for some small installations but no large-scale acquisitions?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MACK of Washington. If it is agreed later to make that installation, it will be located at Port Chicago or some other place that is satisfactory?

Mr. VINSON. We will take that up later, but there is nothing in here covering the buffer zone at Port Chicago.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am addressing this question to the gentleman from Illinois because of the implication he made. I know that the wise and great committee has reason for it, but in the report I notice that the Fifth Army received only 2.9 percent of the total building program for the Army, the Fourth Army received 6.2 percent, and the Third Army 5.8. I presume there is good reason for that, but I know the gentleman from Illinois and the rest of us from Illinois when we get back to the Midwest will be questioned about that.

Mr. ARENDS. A lot of this is based on military priority needs, but I can say to my colleague from Illinois as a Member from Illinois that we were watching out for all these things from our particular area.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was very much interested in reading the committee report pertaining to real estate. On page 27 and the immediately following pages there is an inventory for the first time, and I am happy to receive it, of the amount of real estate and improvements the military establishments now have. On page 28 it gives us what has been disposed of over the period of the past 10 years. It gives an item showing the cost. What I am interested in is knowing how much the Federal Treasury

received in return for the disposition of this property and whether or not we had a net gain or a net loss. I should like to know what accounting is given of that.

Mr. VINSON. I will say, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, that the only agency which would have the information on that is the General Services Administration. We do not have the information. We go on the assumption that it is done in a good businesslike way and that no Government property is given away unless the Government receives its fair market value.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further to pursue further this line, certainly the Military Establishment has some idea as to how much it involves when it comes to the disposal of land.

Mr. VINSON. I would say "No." The military department, when it turns over to another agency of Government, the General Services Administration, any property for the other agency to dispose of, it naturally washes its hands of the property. And when another agency steps in and does dispose of the property, under the law, the military department would not normally attempt to keep track of it. They would have no information other than that which would be voluntarily sent to them. Their military interest is finished.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I might suggest this: On the disposal of personal property, the figures seem to run at about \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year in excess property that the Military Establishment is disposing of, for which we get about 8 cents on the dollar. One of the best checks that we would have on our system, I might suggest, is to find out what is disposed of because it reveals to us where the system is not operating properly. I think the Military Establishment ought to know and follow through in these instances where they have an inventory which shows us here that there is \$3,780,000,000 worth of property and improvements; that is, the cost to the Government. Now, it would be very interesting to find out why over a period of 10 years we have had that amount of surplus generated, if there had been proper planning in the beginning.

Mr. VINSON. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri that as fast as the Committee on Armed Services can dispose of the legislation before us, and when we get a breathing spell and can get down to this question, we will be more than delighted to ask the General Services Administration to give us a report as to what amount of money it receives from the disposal of any real estate. We do not have that information today.

Mr. ARENDS. I think, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a good point. It impresses me as a very good idea to try to get the information for him and all Members of the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and to add this one comment. The reason I bring this up here, of course, is that here we are generating considerable additional money. I like the way the Committee on Armed Services have gone

ahead and have begun to dig into these things. But, I note on page 30 the committee makes this statement:

The three departments admitted that a substantial number of projects for which increased authorization is necessary were poorly planned in the first instance and did not reflect anything but the most general estimates of cost.

I have felt that as a Member of Congress that that has been going on for some time. In spite of the words of reassurance that the gentleman has given me that this time it is different, I am still quite disturbed about it. But I do want to say that this looks like real progress and my suggestion of going into these things further is simply in the nature of making a suggestion as to how we can get on top of this matter.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to make this brief comment. The Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo., is still with us in this bill to the tune of a little better than \$2 million.

Mr. ARENDS. I well recall the gentleman's interest in that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has consumed 24 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, you have already heard from the chairman of the committee a description of the overall bill. You have been informed with respect to the highlights in the programs of each of the three departments and you have a description of the general provisions of the bill.

I think that every Member of the House now understands the magnitude and importance of H. R. 8240 and I will not, therefore, repeat any of the areas which have already been covered. I will devote my remarks to the Strategic Air Command.

The Strategic Air Command's ability to conduct offensive air operations on a global basis is recognized as the primary deterrent to enemy aggression. This Nation is always faced with the possibility that this powerful deterrent will be ignored by potential aggressors, if they believe our strategic forces are vulnerable to surprise attack.

We know that the Soviet Union has committed itself to work of creating a strong, modern, long-range offensive bomber force. It is readily apparent that this capability is a prime threat to our national security. Should this force be employed in a surprise attack against the United States, then the Strategic Air Command must immediately mount nuclear attacks designed to destroy the enemy's will and ability to wage war before overwhelming and irrevocable damage can be inflicted on the United States. This retaliation must be done quickly, to be effective, and in great weight to be decisive.

The major force within the Defense Establishment that has the potential to

launch immediate attacks against critical Soviet targets is our Strategic Air Command. Through the immediate employment of this force, we can reach critical targets in sufficient time to minimize a Soviet air attack launched against ourselves or against our allies.

In giving meaning to our national policy of deterrence, the Department of the Air Force is taking action to continually improve the weapons systems of the Strategic Air Command, and provide it with the immediate reaction time required to employ the force under the circumstances which I have just outlined.

About 45 percent of the Air Force portion of the bill is directly related to improvement of the strike capability of the Strategic Air Command and the maintenance of SAC's constant readiness. These SAC operational and support projects include sites for strategic missiles; bases for dispersal of the heavy bomber squadrons; additional facilities required by the conversion from B-36's to B-52's; northern tanker bases; facilities and aviation fuel storage at overseas bases; housing and community facilities; and other essential base support items including aircraft maintenance facilities, ammunition storage, refueling facilities, mission training facilities, and unit operations buildings.

The intercontinental capability of the B-52 was dramatically demonstrated in the recent round-the-world flight with which you are familiar. You are also familiar with the concept of dispersal and the initial increment that was authorized in the 1957 Military Construction Program. The facilities provided by the Air Force's 1957 and 1958 military construction program will, when completed, substantially reduce the vulnerability of the Strategic Air Command's Heavy Bombardment Force and will contribute greatly to its capability to react quickly and mount a significant retaliatory strike.

In recognition of the extreme high costs to disperse this force by providing completely new bases, the Air Force has, up until this time, dispersed the force within the existing inventory of bases, taking advantage of facilities already in place, to reduce the cost of this program.

Obviously, the deployment of bombardment units from existing bases to dispersal bases will do two things: First, in some instances it displaces units now in place at the dispersed locations; second, it creates facilities at Strategic Air Command bases which cannot be used to capacity by the remaining Strategic Air Command's mission.

An immediate question arises: Are we, through dispersal, vacating facilities that are already in use at existing bases? To understand the answer—which is essentially "No"—we must look at the deployment of the entire force in the United States.

As you are aware, there has been some decline in the numbers of wings now programmed for the Air Force. The 137-wing program has been reduced to a program of 128 wings, effective by the end of fiscal year 1958. We can expect further reduction in the future, as the

combat power of Air Force units increases with improved weapons systems.

It is interesting to note that the force deployments in the United States remain substantially the same as under the 137-wing program. With this in mind, the Air Force has redeployed the force in the United States by placing units of other commands on Strategic Air Command bases to take advantage of the facilities made vacant by the dispersal of Strategic Air Command units. We must also consider that the heavy bombardment wings previously were composed of 30 B-36's with no requirement for air refueling squadrons. The heavy bombardment wing is now composed of 45 B-52 aircraft and 20 air refueling aircraft, so that instead of considering the dispersal of 30 B-36's, we must provide facilities for 65 large aircraft.

An example of this is at Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak. Its current utilization is 30 B-36 aircraft, and a Strategic Air Support Squadron composed of 12 C-124 aircraft. The utilization at Ellsworth supported by the Air Force military construction program, after dispersal of the heavy bombardment squadrons, is 55 large aircraft. These require the same space as that previously required by the B-36 wing and the strategic support squadron.

A fighter wing is being placed at Briggs Air Force Base and a tactical reconnaissance wing is being placed at Walker Air Force Base to substantially use the facilities vacated when the squadrons disperse from these locations. These actions are illustrative of the scope of action being taken to utilize existing facilities.

The Air Force has given very serious consideration to the matter of dispersing this Strategic Air Command force and, at the same time, making maximum use of facilities by such dispersal. In my opinion, the deployments of the forces in the United States, as supported by the Air Force 1958 military construction program, is sound, avoids new construction where possible, and makes maximum use of existing facilities.

I would like to conclude on a note which I think is of overriding importance. It has been the thought of many people that the day of the intercontinental ballistic missile is with us, that we had the absolute weapon—and the long-range bomber would soon become a thing of the past.

Perhaps this day will come—perhaps we all here on the floor of the House today will see that day. But, gentlemen, that day is not today nor is it any day in the reasonably foreseeable future.

The short-range missiles, it is true, have, in effect, taken the place of artillery pieces and have proved very successful. Nothing, however, is in existence today, or can be anticipated to be in existence for a considerable time to come, which will take the place of the long-range Strategic Air Command bomber. The SAC force is our first—our primary—and in some very real sense, our present current deterrent to aggression.

So, I believe that we can look forward to many, many more years of dependence on the long-range strategic bomber of the Strategic Air Command. It would

be dangerous to my mind to let any feeling of complacency creep into our thinking—permit any feeling that a pushbutton type of defense or offense is with us today. It may come, but it is far off yet.

I have devoted my remarks to the Strategic Air Command of our great Air Force. I have done this because of my own strong interest in SAC and because of my own profound admiration for the people who have led SAC and are leading it today. Gen. Curtis LeMay, now Assistant Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has given his official life to the work of building up the SAC force and he has done a magnificent job.

I would not mean to imply, however, by the restriction of my remarks to this great element of the Air Force to indicate any lack of interest in or support of the other two services.

As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, we examined most closely the individual items which make up the programs of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. We found the program to be a close one, a tight one—one which had been obviously well thought out—well planned—and I might say, well presented by the witnesses of the three services who appeared before the committee.

Indeed, I wish to leave no impression whatsoever that the functions of the other services are not of great importance. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force together form a team—each doing its own job—each complementing the other—and together forming a defensive, or if need be, an offensive force which is second to none in the world.

The bill is one more step toward insuring that our military forces remain second to none. I feel its passage is an absolute essential to this end.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of our committee, a man who has served in the Congress of the United States some 43 years. To me he is one of the outstanding Americans of our day, a great civic patriot who has contributed the greater part of his life to his Nation. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he has the responsibility for the development of programs to build and maintain our great national defense to meet any emergency that may arise in a critical and chaotic world. By his work over a long period of years he has earned and deserves the hearty commendation of the membership on both sides of the aisle. I have been privileged as a member of the Armed Services Committee to have the opportunity to work with him for many years. He is conscientious and thorough in his work. He spends hours and days and weeks in scrutinizing every item in the defense program. His wise counsel and guidance and direction is eagerly sought on all programs of national defense. The soundness of this bill we have before us today is a tribute to the able leadership and direction of

our very able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. It is a program calling for some \$1.6 billion, and it is legislation which has for its objective the strengthening and maintenance of our national defense. Now a word about the Department of the Army program.

The Army's construction program for fiscal year 1958 totals \$297,714,000 in new authorization as contained in title I of H. R. 8240. The title would also permit reprogramming of certain prior years' authorization for sorely needed family housing. I feel that the Army's request is both modest and minimal, when taking into consideration its stated construction requirement for fiscal year 1958 of approximately \$919 million. Exhaustive reviews of this program within the Department of Defense, the Executive Office of the President, and the Congress have reduced the program to the bare minimum.

As you are all aware, the primary purpose of the Army is to provide a deterrent to war in conjunction with its sister services. A strong, combat-ready Army is an essential part of the deterrent forces needed for our national security. The Army provides a deterrent to general and local wars through its overseas deployments covering vital strategic areas, by its contribution to the continental air defense of the United States, by the presence of ready, highly mobile forces, and by its capability to apply measured force to varying situations.

Toward this end, the fiscal year 1958 construction program has been developed. Thirty-nine percent of the program is devoted to strengthening the Nike defense system in continental United States; 45 percent is for the construction of permanent plant to house and support our Army in continental United States and its Territories; and 16 percent of the total is for construction of shorter term requirements in continental United States and temporary base rights areas overseas.

For the air defense of the continental United States, this bill will provide additional construction totaling \$115 million for tactical facilities, and an additional \$8,500,000 for logistical support of this highly important mission.

The need for adequate air defense of the United States is absolutely vital. This is required to support the national policy of deterrence. Army surface-to-air guided missiles make the major contribution to the defense against the atomic air threat as it exists today and may exist in the foreseeable future.

In the field of land-based air defense, the Army has a demonstrated competence unmatched by any other service. This competence manifests itself in many ways, including the following: The existence of trained missile units deployed on site; completed training in missile skills for thousands of personnel; a major training establishment in being at Fort Bliss; the availability of a competent development base of Army agencies and contractors; and the presence of an experienced and operating logistical support system.

The Army's air defense tactical facilities program in fiscal year 1958 is a logical extension of the overall air defense development program initiated in 1951, revised continuously to reflect the rapidly advancing technology in the guided-missiles field. Thus, the present program will, by the introduction of the Army Nike-Hercules guided-missile system, provide the first air defense capable of firing atomics.

Fortunately, our present Nike sites are readily converted to accommodate these new atomic weapons. With reasonable modification and costs, the present Nike sites can accommodate new weapons—such as the atomic Nike Hercules, for long-term use.

In addition, this program introduces facilities for the first increment of a new low-altitude system—the Hawk.

The air defense tactical facilities program is a vital step toward assuring that the planned continental air defense posture will keep pace with any enemy's capability, and will deny him the ability to destroy the mobilization and retaliatory potential of the United States.

The Army will never be any better than the people who serve in it. The modern Army, with its complicated weapons and exacting leadership requirements, is striving to improve the quality of its personnel and the way in which they are utilized. While the Army is making encouraging progress in increasing the professional proportion of its strength, the basic problem is not merely the training of personnel to a higher level of professional ability but more particularly the retention of such personnel after they are trained.

The ability to retain trained, qualified personnel is dependent to a large measure upon the availability of suitable living accommodations for personnel and their dependents. A great many of our soldiers are still living in outmoded, high-maintenance-cost World War II facilities, which for the most part have long passed their normal life expectancy. H. R. 8240 as drafted will partially alleviate these undesirable conditions by providing 13,504 permanent enlisted barracks spaces; 360 permanent bachelor officer quarters; and 415 units of appropriated fund family housing, at a total estimated cost of approximately \$50 million.

The Army also is making considerable progress toward providing adequate facilities to support its mission in the field of light aviation. Last year the Army requested, and the Congress authorized, \$14.4 million for the first major step forward in providing aviation facilities for the Army's aircraft. This year's bill will provide an additional \$20.8 million in new authorization for construction at 17 permanent stations.

Organic Army aviation consists of fixed- and rotary-wing aircraft which the Army requires continually, within its units, for the discharge of Army missions incident to ground combat. These aircraft are characterized by capability of short takeoffs and landings on unprepared fields, and generally by relatively low performance in comparison to the

aircraft of the Air Force. They are immediately available and responsive to the requirements of the ground units commanders. The functions for which these aircraft are provided in the combat zone—observation, airlift for troop movement, movement of supplies, mobility for land reconnaissance, command, liaison and communication, and aeromedical evacuation—do not duplicate those of the Air Force although there may be some overlap immediately forward of the area of contact.

Army aviation is capable of living in the field, but like the combat infantrymen who move out of the mud and into barracks during peacetime, its aircraft must have minimum adequate base facilities when not engaged in combat. Otherwise their operation would involve costs considerably higher than necessary, due to increased wear and tear and attrition losses, and because of the increased flying hazards associated with field operations.

In temporary base rights overseas areas, the Army has reduced its fiscal year 1958 construction requirements to an absolute minimum. Construction is limited basically to France, Korea, and Army Security Agency bases; \$20,754,000 is proposed for authorization for further construction of the line of communications across France. The French line of communications is rapidly nearing completion, and consists primarily of a 12-inch petroleum pipeline and backup supply depots stocking critical combat materials, the very life's blood of our combat-ready troops now stationed in Germany.

In Korea further improvements to troop living and operating conditions will be provided at an estimated cost of \$9 million. The Army has finally succeeded in getting troops out of tents and into low-cost prefabricated buildings in Korea. Although the construction in Korea is limited to the most austere, temporary-type facilities, they are most welcome to our troops in lieu of the field-tent camps occupied up to early 1956.

I have served as a member of the Armed Services Committee for many years. In this capacity I have become quite familiar with the Army's construction programs, and the methods of development used. The Army has used a proven system of master planning for its construction for over 10 years. This system, which is analogous to city planning, provides a sound, well-balanced annual program. The continual review processes of construction requirements effected at all echelons of Army command have gained my confidence, as well as yours I am sure, in the Army's ability to plan and execute its construction program. I feel that this year's program is a fine example of this ability.

The program is not large. It has been developed under austere budget guidance. It will provide only the Army's bare, minimum construction needs in fiscal year 1958, and is consistent with the Nation's economy.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is complimented by the confidence which the other Members of the House have in the deliberations of our committee.

As our distinguished chairman has said, we worked on this bill about a month. Every line item came under our scrutiny, under the tireless leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

We approached this bill not with the assurance in mind that there would be any disarmament. We do not look for that at the moment. I do not care what is going on in London; we have seen the developments of the last week in Russia and what has emerged from the Politburo in Russia.

We see now who is the leader in Russia. We have heard from General Twining how those Russians carry on when they give a party. And Khrushchev is not a teetotaler. He is in charge of Russia. So we had better keep our bases in first-class condition and implement those which are necessary. That is what this bill does. We have no new bases, but those which we have are going to be in first-class shape. We do not want to wake up one morning and have one man in Russia declare war on this country out of the dark, or out of the blue.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks deal primarily with the Air Force. I could have taken any one of the other branches of the services. I have dealt with what is going on in the hardware of the Air Force and the need to keep the bases completely up to date with the newest type of hardware for the Air Force.

I commend this bill to the attention of the distinguished membership of the Committee.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has given a fine picture of the whole program. Others have or will deal with particular elements of the program. Whenever any one of us on the Armed Services Committee picks a particular portion of the construction bill to talk about, it doesn't mean that we feel that other portions or other programs in the bill are of necessarily less importance. It means simply that we, as individuals, wish to give the House a reasonably well distributed series of remarks in order that all of the various portions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force programs can be presented in a somewhat more precise and understandable fashion.

If I were going to be completely personal in my remarks on this bill, I would find myself torn between our great Navy and our great Air Force. And by this I mean that my own experience, background, and day-to-day activity embraces many problems of these two services.

Other members of the committee find that their problems and area of activity are devoted to one of these services or to the Army. It is a natural tendency to

speak on subjects which are most familiar to you. I have chosen today to speak on the Air Force. But I could just as well, and with just as strong feeling, have chosen the Navy.

Every fighting force is made up of three elements—men, weapons, and bases to fight from. This bill has one single purpose and that is to provide the bases which our forces can fight from.

The Air Force has a vital interest in the development of a modern base structure. In fact, it must be considered equal in importance to the development of aircraft and missiles with increased speed, range, and striking power, for the degree of development of airbases, missile sites, and radar stations determines the effectiveness of these weapons as instruments of defense. Continued progress in the construction and modernization of airbases is essential to maintaining the ready effective Air Force that our national security demands.

The Air Force installations program of the last several years has been aimed at providing airbase facilities required for the 137-wing Air Force that in 1953 was approved as the Air Force goal. The original goal of 137 combat wings by June 1957 now has been modified after a thorough review of the Air Force task and today's more modern and more powerful equipment and weapons.

In fiscal year 1958, the Air Force proposes to reduce the force to 128 wings. These changes are not arbitrary—but stem from a review of the task to be accomplished and the means at their disposal to get the job done, which include more modern equipment and more powerful weapons. Although the force is reducing in numbers, capability is being increased by virtue of tremendously increased striking capability and firepower.

No new aircraft operating bases will be initiated inside the United States under the Air Force construction program for fiscal year 1958. By virtue of effecting unit redeployments in combination with the reduced numbers of units, present base requirements for the forces will be satisfied by adaptation and utilization of existing bases.

I would like to refer briefly to the progress being made in the overall Air Force program, with particular reference to aircraft and weapons, because the characteristics of the aircraft and weapon systems used establish the pattern and type of operational facilities required on our air bases.

The last year saw production and assignment of the newest type aircraft to combat units. The Strategic Air Command has improved its capability by replacement of B-36's with B-25's with four of the heavy bomber wings scheduled for conversion by the end of this fiscal year. By the end of fiscal 1958, the B-36 wings will be down to 3 and the B-52 wings will be up to 8. In addition, each B-52 wing will be equipped with 45 planes as compared to the 30 planes in a B-36 wing.

In line with the overall modernization of the Air Force, all fighters now under procurement are of the supersonic 100 series—frequently called the Century

Series. The capability of the Air National Guard and Air Reserve are being increased by receiving F-86 and F-84 equipment earlier than originally planned by reason of aircraft being made available through reduction in the number of active fighter units.

In the transport field, the first C-133 turboprop cargo plane, designed for about twice the payload capacity of the largest transports now in service, was flown last year. The turboprop C-130, a great advance over any troop carrier aircraft, is being assigned to Tactical Air Command medium troop carrier wings.

The integration of missiles into the Air Force weapons system continues to hold high priority. Already in use by the all-weather interceptor aircraft in operational units is the Falcon missile which is a dependable missile of high kill capability. The Air Force is also planning to use the Navy-developed Sidewinder air-to-air missile on certain day fighters.

To supplement the fighter interceptors, development of the Bomarc ground-to-air missile is being expedited. Once operational in effective numbers, it should reduce the requirement for short range, manned interceptors.

In offensive missiles, the first tactical missile in the Air Force is the Matador. One wing is equipped and is in position in Europe.

The Air Force has long range surface-to-surface missiles under development—both air breathing and ballistic. The ballistic missile development programs are substantially on the schedule established over a year ago. Excellent progress is being made in these projects and they are in various early stages of flight testing.

As to adequate control and warning systems, present warning lines are being improved and expanded. The main portion of the distant early warning line—DEW line—which provides the longer warning time necessary for timely launching of our retaliatory and air defense forces, is now nearing completion and will meet its scheduled operational date.

Eastern and western extensions to the main line are programed and partially funded.

The development, testing, and construction of SAGE our semiautomatic ground environment system which operates as a computing and control facility to control our advanced air defense weapons against multiple targets, is being continued.

Although significant progress has been made in the past several years in development of a base structure to support a modern Air Force, much remains to be done. The need for concurrent satisfaction of base requirements for new weapons systems and elimination of deficiencies at present bases requires that expenditures for Air Force military construction be maintained at a substantial level for several years to come.

We have no choice in this respect. We must continue to maintain the strongest possible military force and we cannot do this without meeting the constantly

changing needs of our military services as modern developments themselves make these changes necessary.

We have built a great Air Force and we have already built a great base structure for it. But we will be back again next year for more essential construction to round out and render more perfect our operational facilities and, of almost equal importance, to provide personnel facilities which have for the past several years gone by the board in order that most of the authority and most of the funds could be devoted to the operating essentials.

The Armed Services Committee has reported out a sound bill. It has been pared and shaved down to a fine point. I would personally hesitate to go further than the executive branch and the committee has already gone. This bill represents a hard core and is a bill that every Member of this House should support wholeheartedly.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 133]

Abbitt	Dingell	Miller, N. Y.
Adair	Dollinger	Minshall
Alexander	Donohue	Moore
Alger	Dorn, N. Y.	Morano
Andersen,	Eberharter	Morgan
H. Carl	Fallon	Morrison
Anderson,	Fino	Moulder
Mont.	Flood	Multer
Anfuso	Fogarty	Mumma
Ashmore	Forand	O'Konski
Barden	Frazier	O'Neill
Barrett	Fulton	Osmer
Bass, N. H.	Gary	Philbin
Baumhart	Gordon	Polk
Beamer	Granahan	Powell
Bennett, Mich.	Green, Pa.	Prouty
Bentley	Griffiths	Radwan
Blich	Gubser	Rains
Boggs	Hays, Ohio	Riehlman
Bonner	Healey	Robeson, Va.
Bosch	Hébert	Rodino
Bowler	Hemphill	Rogers, Mass.
Boyle	Hess	Roosevelt
Breeding	Holtzman	Santangelo
Brown, Mo.	Ikard	Seely-Brown
Brownson	James	Shelley
Broyhill	Jennings	Spence
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Staggers
Byrne, Ill.	Kearns	Taylor
Byrne, Pa.	Keogh	Teague, Tex.
Canfield	Kilburn	Teller
Chelf	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Chiperfield	Knutson	Thomson, Wyo.
Christopher	Lane	Thornberry
Chudoff	Latham	Tuck
Coad	Lennon	Vanik
Coffin	McConnell	Van Pelt
Colmer	McCormack	Vorys
Cooley	McCulloch	Vursell
Cunningham,	Macdonald	Watts
Nebr.	Machrowicz	Wharton
Curtin	Mack, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Curtis, Mass.	Madden	Willis
Davis, Tenn.	Magnuson	Wilson, Calif.
Dawson, Ill.	Mailliard	Wilson, Ind.
Delaney	Meador	Yates
Diggs	Morrow	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8240, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 288 Members responded to

their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains approximately 400 installations. The chairman of our committee and the ranking minority member have explained the bill and the manner of its preparation. There has been every opportunity to make inquiry as to any individual line items, so I do not propose to go over line items at this time.

I do want to call attention, however, to Section 412 on page 71 of the bill. For many, many years, those who have had experience with public procurement have come to the conclusion that in order to keep procurement and public contracting fair and honest we must do our procuring-by competitive bids after general advertising.

In 1947—that was during the 80th Congress—the Committee on Armed Services gave very careful consideration to the question of military procurement and at that time we again emphasized the fact that procurement was to be by competitive bids after general advertising. We then passed the Armed Services Uniform Procurement Act. It lays down the law that all contracts and all procurement shall be done by competitive bids after general advertising. However, we did include in that law a section which contained 17 exceptions, 17 instances in which competitive bidding would not be required. One of those was during a period of national emergency declared by the Congress or by the President. In 1950 President Truman, as an incident of the Korean conflict, declared a national emergency. That national emergency has never been terminated. The President does have the power to terminate it if he should see fit to do so, but he has never terminated it. Neither has Congress terminated it. In 1956 we brought in a bill from the Committee on Armed Services which would have terminated it as to military procurement. It passed this House but was never passed by the other body.

Section 412, included in this bill, provides simply that the national emergency declared on December 16, 1950, shall not be used as a basis of negotiation except in the four instances which we provide here. The original law provided that in any case of \$1,000 or less competitive bids would not be necessary. Because of the increase in prices, we raised that to \$2,500. Subsection 2 deals with purchases or contracts for nonperishable subsistence supplies. The third provides for purchases or contracts for property or services, for experimental, development, or research work, or making or furnishing property for experiment, test, development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000. Then follows the provision for small business and labor distressed areas.

Hearings on this bill indicated that construction by the military has now been awarded on competitive bids to the extent of approximately 93 percent, but on other procurement the negotiated contract is being used about 93 percent and competitive bids only about 7 percent. Of course, that takes in every 1 of the 17 exceptions to competitive bidding. But because of the Korean emergency in 9 months last year the Defense Department acquired various supplies to the extent of \$5,318,550,000, or 38.94 percent of dollar expenditures. All this was done by negotiation under the Korean emergency.

In addition, while the Department lists a tremendous amount of money that is expended without competitive bids but gives one of the other 16 exceptions as the basis for those contracts, it must be remembered that as long as this national emergency can be resorted to, then the Department just administratively determines that it comes under one or another exception, and they proceed to buy, whereas if we carry out what we propose in this bill, we will come back to our traditional system, what the Republican 80th Congress declared should be the law and what we wrote in the Armed Services Uniform Procurement Act. As several gentlemen have said, this is an excellent provision and should be enacted into law, and I am sure will be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman's proposal cover offshore procurements?

Mr. KILDAY. No. My recollection is that that would come within one of the 17 other provisions. Seven percent of construction that we have now by negotiated contract is practically all overseas. We do not find that procurement in other countries comes as easily under competitive bidding as procurement here in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand that, and I want to commend the gentleman for his proposal, but I hope some way can be devised to cover offshore procurement, at least some phases of it.

Mr. KILDAY. I am not sure that we are at this time in a position to write a law that would be applicable in foreign countries, with their different systems of doing business, with their different concepts of competitive bids and things of that kind. But, I think we are going a long way if we can get the procurement of our military supplies back under the general law, because anyone with experience in this subject knows that so long as you require competitive bids, with general advertising, you avoid favoritism, and the opportunity or temptations for dishonesty are reduced, if not eliminated. I am sure the professional officers of the military services who are engaged in procurement would much rather have competitive bidding so that their careers would not be endangered as they are now every day of the week.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I should like the debate to show, in the legislative history of the discussion of this matter, that it is the sense of the Congress that we are seeking open competitive bidding, not the type of bidding by invitation to a selected few, but by general advertising, which would be true open competitive bidding.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, I know that a good amount of the bidding that is claimed to have been competitive bidding was competitive only in the sense that there were two or three or four concerns invited to bid and they bid in competition. But this provided for only very limited competition, only competition from those who had been invited. So that I have attempted to see to it that each time these contracts are required by law to be awarded upon competitive bids after general advertising.

Mr. PRICE. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

[Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee did such an excellent job of explaining this measure, as he usually does. I do not think I have ever seen him bring a bill to the floor of this House which was not well thought out and well explained.

My remarks will be in the nature of a brief statement on the Research and Development Command and the construction required in support of its test and development programs.

It is a great pleasure for me to do this because I believe that our future, possibly our very existence, as a Nation and as human beings depends in good measure upon the results of the efforts of research and development. My reasoning is this: It is an accepted fact that any future war with nuclear weapons will be catastrophic beyond comprehension. It is also an accepted fact that this Nation's airpower—Navy and Air Force—will constitute a great factor in preventing or winning any future war. Our Nation must have superior airpower.

Our basic philosophy has been that superior airpower, seapower and landpower are possible only with the right quality and quantity. We have, in our planning, based many of our major policy decisions on the premise that we will maintain qualitative superiority. We have depended heavily on the ability of this Nation to continue to develop superior weapons systems. We have constantly sought qualitative superiority rather than quantitative superiority and this effort must continue.

As you know, the primary source for maintaining this qualitative superiority is in the field of research and development. In this bill there are, in round numbers, items of research and devel-

opment construction for each of the three services as follows:

Army	\$11,000,000
Navy	9,000,000
Air Force	24,000,000

In this day of complicated weapon systems, a new device rarely comes into being as a result of accident or genius on the part of an individual, rather it is usually the result of thousands, sometimes million of hours of research and development effort. This is the organized approach. It is the mission of our research and development people to seek new basic knowledge; to develop new and improved devices, processes, and techniques; and to maintain qualitative superiority of material.

This bill will provide for the construction of facilities at the centers in support of research and development projects now under way or planned in the near future.

Due to the complexity of our current weapons in the aerodynamic, electronic, and mechanical fields, and because of the extremes of the operating conditions of these systems in both altitudes and speeds, the research and development plant grows more complex as the weapons themselves grow more complex.

The research and development facilities must continually be capable of providing an environment in which the development of our weapons can flourish. An example of this type of environment is the Air Force Missile Test Center located in Florida which has been constructed since the end of World War II to fulfill the demanding engineering requirements for research, development, and operational testing of our missile systems. It has the capability of pinpointing these missiles from the surface to an altitude of 450 miles and from Florida to the Ascensions in the South Atlantic, a distance of 5,000 miles. This center, as well as those of the Army and Navy, were developed in direct fulfillment of a research and development requirement and have greatly assisted in making possible our tremendous technical advances in all of the scientific fields.

Because of the foresight of this country in constructing, maintaining, and improving these types of experimental and testing facilities, the United States has maintained its lead in weapons superiority over any other country in the world. It is only through the continued improvement and modernization of these facilities as reflected in the current research and development construction program that we will be able to keep our research and development plant abreast of the technical requirements of our weapons systems.

I, of course, support this entire bill wholeheartedly, and I have stressed those portions relating to research and development only because of my intense personal interest in this field of activity.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

MRS. GRACE GOODHUE COOLIDGE

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to announce to the House the death of Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, widow of the 30th President of the United States. Her death came quietly at 12:50 this morning in her beloved and beautiful adopted city of Northampton, Mass., the place she came to 55 years ago to teach the deaf and dumb and the place she met and married the man who climbed from small city lawyer to Governor of Massachusetts, to Vice President, and President of this great land.

That Grace Coolidge played a leading and important role in the meteoric rise of President Coolidge is acknowledged by all modern historians. The simplicity of her manner, her extreme graciousness and her enduring charm were attributes which overflowed from her great personality. She was a great woman. She was a good woman. She was possessed with a fine mind and a warm heart.

Her goodness and her warmness were nowhere better exemplified than in the career she entered upon graduating from the University of Vermont. For she came to Northampton, Mass., to teach the deaf and the dumb—those unexplainable tragedies of society who are bereft of speech and hearing.

She never lost her interest in nor her love for the Clarke School for the Deaf and Dumb for she continued as a trustee to her death and frequently visited the school to rejoice in its advancement and the progress of its children.

Mr. Coolidge's place as the First Lady of the Nation during her years in the White House was marked by the same simplicity and graciousness that had won friends and admirers wherever she set up house.

She understood people and she loved humanity. Human beings were her interest, her career. What a consolation and asset she was to her husband as he climbed the road of success from councilman, alderman, city solicitor, mayor of Northampton, State senator, lieutenant governor, governor, Vice President, and the crowning jewel of all, the Presidency of the United States.

I know that many of you, especially our elder statesmen, are aware that Mrs. Coolidge was not only a woman of extraordinary ability and humane instinct, but that she was also a person of great personal charm who presided over the social life and the White House with the dignity and graciousness of a perfect hostess.

She was a loyal wife who rejoiced in her husband's successes and encouraged him to overcome the obstacles that frequently stood in his path during his career. She consoled him in times of sorrow, especially in 1924 when death took their son, Calvin Coolidge, Jr., at the age of 17 and may I note in passing

that her death occurred almost on the same date and the same hour of the 33d anniversary of the passing of Calvin, Jr., on whom she and her husband had set such great store.

I know that Northampton and the Nation will join me in mourning this truly great woman and expressing sympathy to her son, John. Mrs. Coolidge will be remembered not only for her striking personality but as a woman who lived her life with a sturdy faith in God, inherited from her rugged Vermont ancestors. She will be remembered as one who walked humbly all her days although destiny had raised her into the high and mighty places.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk now read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, \$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Ala.: Utilities, \$2,015,000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, Calif.: Utilities, \$130,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebr.: Maintenance facility, \$249,000.

White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Ga.: Operational facility, land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Va.: Operational facility, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Wash.: Land acquisition, \$40,000.

Sharpe General Depot, Calif.: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$110,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Tex.: Operational facility, and land acquisition, \$95,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Md.: Utilities, \$627,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, N. H.: Research and development facility, \$2,496,000.

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Operational facilities, training facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Ill.: Utilities, \$765,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y.: Operational facilities, \$1,169,000.

Charleston TC Depot, S. C.: Operational facilities, \$306,000.

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational facilities, troop housing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

Oakland Army Base, Calif.: Medical facility, \$602,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colo.: Troop housing, \$937,000.

Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Utilities, \$1,920,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army area)

Fort Devens, Mass.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,859,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

(Second Army area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Va.: Troop housing, \$153,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Administrative facility, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

Fort Ritchie, Md.: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,703,000.

Fort Stewart, Ga.: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, La.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex.: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

(Fifth Army area)

Fort Carson, Colo.: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Utilities, \$336,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

(Sixth Army area)

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,231,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

(Armed Forces special weapons)

Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

(Tactical installations support facilities)

Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

Outside continental United States (Alaskan area)

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific command area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

(Caribbean command area)

Fort Buchanan, P. R.: Community facility, and utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, C. Z.: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase out of appropriations available for military construction family housing including necessary land at, or near, military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations as now or hereafter established for military housing constructed with appropriated funds.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical services facilities (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal, Tex., strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,212,000."

(b) Public Law 209, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000," respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)" with respect to Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$2,360,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,137,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)" with respect to United States Military Academy, N. Y., strike out "\$9,950,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,983,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,870,000," respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,039,000."

(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y., strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$212,000."

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee, Va., strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,874,000."

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Md., strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof "\$525,000."

(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,491,000."

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y., strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,240,000."

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Va., strike out "\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,072,000."

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center, Tex., strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof "\$876,000."

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash., strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof "\$669,000."

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C., strike out "\$3,557,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Md., strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof "\$800,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, S. C., strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,400,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Tex., strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,283,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)"—

(1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colo., strike out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,000."

(2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,893,000."

(3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Mich., strike out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,204,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Alaskan Area"—with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$559,000."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$225,277,000", "\$74,984,000", and "\$534,254,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$240,220,000", "\$75,074,000", and "\$549,287,000", respectively.

Sec. 107. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof "\$136,000."

(2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Ala., strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,593,000."

Under the subheading "Technical Services Facilities (Quartermaster Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000."

(2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot, Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,847,000."

Under the subheading "Field Forces Facilities"—

(1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Tex., strike out "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000."

(2) with respect to Fort Sill, Okla., strike out "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000."

(3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,373,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,783,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,000", "\$203,331,000", and "\$334,104,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyards Facilities

Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Md.: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.: Drydock, \$25,438,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Utilities, \$1,452,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Utilities, \$115,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Facilities for remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$1,500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities, \$2,998,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Medical facilities, \$391,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Key West, Fla.: Troop housing, \$1,326,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, \$544,000.

Naval Station, Newport, R. I.: Troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$3,312,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Waterfront facilities, \$7,808,000.

Aviation Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Tex.: Operational facilities, \$566,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Operational facilities (optical landing system), \$140,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Ga.: Utilities, \$293,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Tex.: Operational facilities (optical landing system), \$160,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss.: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$15,067,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, La.: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Fla.: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

(Fleet support air stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Operational facilities (guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities and land acquisition, \$180,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, \$7,751,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Calif.: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, N. C.: Operational facilities, \$199,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Calif.: Operational facilities, messhall, and land acquisition, \$4,774,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational facilities and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$5,728,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla.: Operational facilities (optional landing system), \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$30,594,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Fla.: Operational facilities, \$384,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Operational facilities, \$3,401,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Operational facilities (aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, Calif.: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and utilities, \$9,448,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Operational facilities and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, S. C.: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,503,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.: Operational facilities \$3,620,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, Calif.: Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, N. C.: Operational facilities and utilities, \$132,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pa.: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.: Operational facilities, \$2,209,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Operational facilities (including op-

erational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$3,479,000.

Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field (location to be determined): Land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

Supply Facilities

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pa.: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Ga.: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,001,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,256,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.: Community facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif.: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.: Utilities, \$316,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif.: Supply facilities, \$114,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, Calif.: Research and development facilities, \$494,000.

Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Dain-gerfield, Tex.: Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md.: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$723,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Dormitory foundations, \$1,602,000.

Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, S. C.: Troop housing, \$1,225,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities and troop housing, \$5,375,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Va.: Operational facilities, \$443,000.

Naval Communication Station, Newport, R. I.: Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Diego, Calif.: Operational facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Communication Center, Stockton, Calif.: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research and development facilities, \$180,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Utilities, \$332,000.

Public Works Center, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities, \$3,244,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Supply facilities and administrative facilities, \$759,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H.: Waterfront facilities and operational facilities, \$6,076,000.

Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, community facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, T. H.: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$332,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,699,000.

Naval Station, San Juan, P. R.: Utilities, \$190,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,000.

Naval Station, Argentina, Canada: Family housing and community facilities, \$1,793,000.

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H.: Operational facilities (aircraft parking areas), \$2,088,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational facilities, \$5,730,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, T. H.: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facilities), \$69,000.

Naval Station, Midway Islands, T. H.: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities at White Beach, \$504,000.

Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities, \$1,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, \$884,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Supply facilities and utilities, \$2,098,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H.: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, \$904,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval communication station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval station, Argentina, Canada: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$898,000.

Naval communication station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval security group activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval security group activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities, \$69,000.

Naval security group activity, southern Japan: Operational facilities, housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$726,000.

Naval radio station, Wahiawa, Oahu, T. H.: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

Public works center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$1,093,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public works center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities \$393,000.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$65,091,000.

Sec. 203. (a) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201, as follows:

Under the subheading "Yards and Docks Facilities," with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000."

(c) Public Law 534, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,927,000."

Sec. 204. (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities" with respect to the naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif., strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif., strike out "\$1,675,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,030,000"; and with respect to the naval air station, Glenview, Ill., strike out "\$70,000" and insert in place thereof "\$170,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$63,358,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$70,656,000."

(c) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$102,956,000", "\$63,358,000", "\$202,807,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$103,555,000", "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000."

Sec. 205. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Shipyard Facilities," with respect to the naval repair facility, San Diego, Calif., strike out "\$629,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,099,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Fleet Base Facilities," with respect to the naval station, Orange, Tex., strike out "\$399,000" and insert in place thereof "\$563,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Naval Air Training Stations)," with respect to the naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex., strike out "\$3,686,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with respect to the naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, La., strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,871,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Fleet Support Air Stations)," with respect to the naval air station, Alameda, Calif., strike out "\$3,729,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to the naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif., strike out "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000"; and with respect to the outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Fla., strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,587,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)," with respect to the naval air station, Lake-

hurst, N. J., strike out "\$16,311,000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Ordnance Facilities," with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex., strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif., strike out "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Service School Facilities" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md., strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place thereof "\$879,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities," with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,235,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Communication Facilities," with respect to the Naval Communication Facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and insert in place thereof "\$3,198,600."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400."

(d) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600," "\$107,191,300," "\$151,342,400," and "\$564,046,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600," "\$108,365,300," "\$152,763,400," and "\$575,592,300."

Sec. 206. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended under the heading "Inside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Shipyard Facilities" with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C., strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif., strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,169,000."

(2) Under the subheading "Fleet Base Facilities," with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va., strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,340,000."

(3) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Fleet Support Air Stations)," with respect to the Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif., strike out "\$3,835,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000."

(4) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)," with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif., strike out "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000."

(5) Under the subheading "Service School Facilities" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,919,000."

(6) Under the subheading "Communication Facilities," with respect to the Naval Communication Station, San Francisco, Calif., strike out "\$2,029,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,779,000."

(7) Under the subheading "Yards and Docks Facilities," with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk, Va., strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof "\$500,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "Aviation Facilities," with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended by striking out in section 203,

"\$84,043,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000."

(d) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$292,572,000," "\$61,625,000," "\$84,043,000," and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$303,453,000," "\$62,001,000," "\$85,939,000," and "\$451,393,000."

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects.

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

Grank Forks Air Force Base, Grank Forks, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$614,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$429,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$905,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,299,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn.: Supply facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,804,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$974,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,074,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,082,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colo.: Land acquisition, \$136,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oreg.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,328,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Community facilities, \$244,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, N. Y.: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$1,128,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,909,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$358,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$48,178,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Troop housing, \$405,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$10,659,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$399,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$5,133,000.

Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Community facilities, \$56,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,077,000.

Air Proving Ground Command

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,784,000.

Air Research and Development Command

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,987,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nev.: Community facilities, \$206,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,962,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,785,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$489,000.

Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex.: Community facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,209,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, \$8,249,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$938,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Community facilities, \$436,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,909,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$653,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and real-estate improvement, \$4,200,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,977,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$4,118,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$865,000.

Air University

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Land acquisition, \$50,000.

Continental Air Command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Medical facilities, \$952,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, N. Y.: Utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$337,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis, Mo.: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C.: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,216,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,089,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$496,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$848,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,344,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,487,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$5,557,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,584,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and real-estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real-estate improvements, \$2,976,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$536,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Community facilities, \$100,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,258,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facilities, \$34,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Maintenance facilities, \$380,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Troop housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Real-estate improvements, \$179,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$13,112,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, \$253,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Land acquisition, \$37,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$936,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,

community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$231,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,892,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,528,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,901,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$235,000.

Tactical Air Command

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, N. Mex.: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,149,000.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenéville, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,287,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.: Troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,558,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$760,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Supply facilities and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Supply facilities and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, land acquisition, and real-estate improvements, \$1,204,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Community facilities, \$745,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real-estate improvements, \$11,558,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Troop housing and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Operational and training facilities and family housing, \$2,035,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$229,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

Outside the United States

Alaskan Air Command

Elelson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, \$430,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operation and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$4,742,000.

Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities, \$350,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$11,500,000.

Air Materiel Command

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and training facilities, \$1,400,000.

Far East Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,642,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$12,738,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$59,613,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$39,217,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$70 million.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$65 million.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—with respect to Pescadero Consolation Station, Pescadero, Calif., strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Okla., strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,756,000."

Under the subheading "Continental Air Command"—with respect to Mitchell Air Force Base, Hempstead, N. Y., strike out "\$729,000" and insert in place thereof "\$929,000"; and strike out "\$686,000" and insert in place thereof "\$886,000."

Under the subheading "Research and Development Command"—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif., strike out "\$27,478,000" and insert in place thereof "\$29,442,000"; and strike out "\$16,192,000" and insert in place thereof "\$18,156,000."

(b) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 so much as reads "\$406,120,000" and "\$415,949,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$409,937,000" and "\$419,766,000," respectively.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash., strike out "\$1,716,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,717,000";

(2) with respect to Grand Fork site, North Dakota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,220,000";

(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., strike out "\$2,029,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,000";

(5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, Calif., strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,935,000";

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich., strike out "\$5,526,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and insert in place thereof "\$893,000";

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Ariz., strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,676,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command"—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala., strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y., strike out "\$15,803,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,654,000";

(3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif., strike out "\$9,522,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,970,000";

(4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$12,001,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,508,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command"—

(1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex., strike out "\$3,438,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,876,000";

(2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex., strike out "\$4,081,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,088,000";

(3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss., strike out "\$500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$545,000";

(4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex., strike out "\$446,000" and insert in place thereof "\$529,000";

(5) with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex., strike out "\$883,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,129,000";

(6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif., strike out "\$1,516,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

(7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex., strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,304,000";

(8) with respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz., strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,556,000."

Under the subheading "Headquarters Command"—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C., strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place thereof "\$825,000."

Under the subheading "Research and Development Command"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary No. 1), Clark, Nev., strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,500."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,363,000."

(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,218,000";

(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif., strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,473,000";

(4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex., strike out "\$6,657,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,324,000."

Under the subheading "Tactical Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, La., strike out "\$2,684,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,527,000";

(2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind., strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$611,000";

(3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif., strike out "\$1,598,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,905,000";

(4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash., strike out "\$4,724,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,197,000";

(5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn., strike out "\$3,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,010,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the heading "Alaska Air Command"—with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out "\$518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000."

Under the subheading "area control navigational aids"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$526,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,394,000."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$801,256,000", "\$532,454,000", and "\$1,339,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$824,300,000", "\$533,539,000", and "\$1,363,189,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "air defense command"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "\$836,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,469,000";

(2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash., strike out "\$2,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,079,000";

(3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont., strike out "\$2,470,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,080,000."

(4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak., strike out "\$18,969,000" and insert in place thereof "\$30,521,000";

(5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo., strike out "\$1,673,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,781,000";

(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., strike out "\$2,156,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,336,000";

(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg., strike out "\$1,130,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,560,000";

(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak., strike out "\$21,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$27,035,000";

(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., strike out "\$3,030,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,409,000";

(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif., strike out "\$2,392,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,779,000";

(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa, strike out "\$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,900,000";

(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis., strike out "\$4,876,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,726,000";

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich., strike out "\$3,278,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,808,000";

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out "\$21,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,201,000."

Under the subheading "air materiel command"—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y., strike out "\$17,966,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,005,000";

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out "\$473,000" and insert in place thereof "\$745,000";

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Wash., strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$251,000";

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla., strike out "\$5,990,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,763,000."

Under the subheading "air training command"—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex., strike out "\$17,121,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,471,000";

(2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala., strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,000";

(3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex., strike out "\$24,433,000" and insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

(4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev., strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,063,000";

(5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla., strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,064,000."

Under the subheading "air university"—with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala., strike out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000."

Under the subheading "continental air command"—

(1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif., strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

(2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga., strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place thereof "\$500,000."

Under the subheading "research and development command"—

(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., strike out "\$6,939,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,530,000";

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif., strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,220,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex., strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,190,000";

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif., strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,643,000";

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss., strike out "\$14,518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak., strike out "\$943,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla., strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,966,000";

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "\$4,952,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,880,000";

(7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "\$1,236,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,586,000";

(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$2,064,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,607,000";

(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., strike out "\$5,697,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,155,000";

(10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y., strike out "\$1,491,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,027,000";

(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H., strike out "\$661,000" and insert in place thereof "\$720,000";

(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex., strike out "\$2,791,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,181,000."

Under the subheading "Tactical Air Command"—with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va., strike out "\$2,613,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,785,000."

(b) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended under the heading "Outside the United States" as follows:

Under the subheading "Northeast Air Command"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000" and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000."

(c) Public Law 968, 84th Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000", "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

TITLE IV

General provisions

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place

permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$120,099,000; outside the United States, \$34,613,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$297,714,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$260,377,000; outside the United States, \$65,627,000; section 202, \$65,091,000; or a total of \$391,095,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$437,357,000; outside the United States, \$225,407,000; section 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$727,764,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code and section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved before July 28, 1954, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100 million that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, 82d Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60 million that is contained in title I, section 102, of Public Law 534, 82d Congress;

(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriations of funds that are contained in the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

SEC. 407. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 5,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 408. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

SEC. 410. The second paragraph of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges for civilian personnel,

amounts equal to the quarters allowances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental charges collected from personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition."

SEC. 411. Prior to the termination of, or reduction in the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity being conducted on the date of enactment of this act within any of the 48 States or the District of Columbia (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished by other than civilian employees of the United States, and where such activity has been conducted for 5 or more years and requires the services of 10 or more civilian employees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed termination or reduction. Such proposed termination or reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of 60 days of continuous session of the Congress following the filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during such 60 days either House of the Congress has adopted a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed termination or reduction described in such report. For the purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

SEC. 412. The authority granted by section 2304 (a) (1), title 10, United States Code, shall not be exercised during the national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, except with respect to—

(1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of which does not involve more than \$2,500;

(2) purchases or contracts for nonperishable subsistence supplies;

(3) purchases or contracts for property or services for experimental, developmental, or research work, or making or furnishing property for experiment, test, development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000.

(4) when in furtherance of small business, labor surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency head determines that supplies or services are to be procured from small-business concerns, from concerns which will perform the contracts substantially within labor surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor, or from concerns which will perform the contracts substantially within areas of major disaster.

SEC. 413. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this act.

SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$147,341,000."

Mr. VINSON (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the

bill be printed at this point and be open to amendment at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 15, line 8, strike out "\$4,660,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 66, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives" and insert in lieu thereof "the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: On page 70, strike out all of section 411 beginning on line 17 and extending through line 16 of page 71.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this section vests veto power in either the Senate or House over decisions of the Secretary of Defense with respect to termination or reduction of any commercial or industrial-type activity which has been in existence 5 or more years and employs 10 or more civilians. My amendment would strike the entire section from the bill. It is the only section in the bill on which there was disagreement in our Committee on Armed Services.

To say the least, this provision is entirely irrelevant to subject matter of the bill. We have before us a multimillion dollar military public works measure, authorizing numerous new projects, and we find embodied in the same measure this superfluous section dealing with a different matter entirely.

It is a rider, so to speak. And what is its real purpose? I must frankly say that it could be interpreted as a political provision, whereby Members of Congress can stop the Secretary of Defense from closing, or even reducing, some manufacturing or some other commercial activity in their district or area. It is not a question whether such activity is actually needed. It is not a question as to how much it costs the taxpayers to operate it. It is not a question whether private enterprise can readily and at less cost supply the items or services involved.

The sole question is how to make certain the personnel operating the facilities do not lose their jobs and how to preserve the benefit for the community or area where the facility is located. That is the purpose of this section.

The Hoover Commission made an extensive study of the business enterprises in which the Federal Government is engaged. It reported that in the Defense Department alone there are more than 2,500, with a capital investment that ex-

ceeds \$15 billion and involving 47 different categories of activities, such as paint manufacturing, rope manufacturing, coffee-roasting plants, various kinds of repair shops, dry-cleaning shops, laundries, and so on.

The Secretary of Defense initiated a program to eliminate these activities where found not essential to our national defense. When the same type of provision as this section 411 was embodied in the 1956 appropriation bill, the whole program was obstructed. With the repeal of that provision last year, the Secretary of Defense has curtailed or closed more than 500 business or industrial-type activities. It is now proposed to set up another roadblock to this program to take the Government out of competition with private enterprise.

Much is said here on the floor about the importance of small business, the problems with which small business is confronted, and we have sought ways and means to help in their solution. If we are really interested in helping small business we will strike this section from the bill. It is with small business that these commercial and industrial-type activities of the Government are in competition.

Much is said here on the floor about the size of the Federal budget, and we have been seeking ways to cut the cost of Government. By terminating or curtailing Government business-type activities, that rightfully belong to private enterprise, we can reduce Government costs. And yet it is proposed by this section to retard and obstruct such a program.

Except in a few instances, Government business-type activities pay no taxes, little or no interest on the capital invested, and generally the directing personnel is on the Government payroll. All this is paid for by the taxpayers. If, on the other hand, these activities were operated by private enterprise the Government would obtain tax revenue from the operation instead of defraying the cost.

Aside from these economic considerations, there is also a constitutional question which this section raises. By seeking to vest in ourselves veto power over executive action are we not violating the Constitution principle that the three branches of the Government are separate and coequal? President Eisenhower raised this question himself when he reluctantly signed the Defense appropriation bill for 1956 that contained this same general type of provision.

Mr. Chairman, this section may be good politics but it is unsound in every other respect. Let us here and now set political considerations aside and cast a vote in the public interest by striking this section from the bill.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It grieves me to find a section so misunderstood and so misrepresented. I am sure that my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] did not intend to cast any particular aspersions or to mislead the House. I am equally sure that he did both.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Certainly that was not my intention.

Mr. HARDY. I am sure of that.

Mr. ARENDS. You know I would not do that.

Mr. HARDY. I am absolutely sure of it, but I want to dispel several other points that were raised by the gentleman right in the very beginning. I believe this House knows me well enough to know that when I say there is no political motivation as far as I am concerned, I am telling the truth.

It happens that this section was generated in the committee by me. It has not the slightest bearing whatever on the question of maintaining the job of anybody; I am concerned only with the protection of the prerogatives of the Congress and in the satisfactory operation of our Department of Defense on an economical basis. I will say to my friend that I am perfectly happy to place the outcome of this matter on the question of what is needed by our Department of Defense from a security standpoint and on the question of economy. If those two criteria are not met, I shall certainly be in accord on going along with any proposal of the Department to close any business-type activity which does not meet them.

As to the question of relevancy, this is a relevant matter which ties also into the question of encroachment on the authority of the Executive.

I think we ought to realize that every single one of these activities was authorized by the Congress generally in a line-item manner, that they were authorized and appropriated for. We authorized the construction of buildings, we authorized the purchase of equipment, we authorized and appropriated funds to pay the personnel, and they have been justified to this Congress year after year after year by the Defense Department. Having exercised our responsibility to authorize these functions we certainly must have been convinced they were needed when we did authorize them. Now, are we going to forget that and say to the Defense Department that some appointive official can come in and change everything we have done heretofore without our even having a chance of reviewing the matter?

This section does not require congressional approval. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], in general debate, made an erroneous statement that I am sure he did not intend to make: He said this section would require congressional approval. That simply is not true. This section merely requires that the Department of Defense submit to the Congress its proposals. For a period of 60 days action is held in abeyance. During that period of time the Congress has the right to review a proposal, to pass a resolution denying the effectiveness of the proposal; and if the Congress does nothing then the action proposed by the Department takes place. Section 411 gives us only an opportunity to review and to pass by affirmative action a resolution denying that particular proposal;

otherwise it becomes effective. To say that the section requires congressional concurrence is strictly inaccurate.

Practically everything the Department of Defense does other than the actual deployment of the Army and the operation of ships and aircraft has a kinship to business operations. There is hardly anything on any military reservation that does not have some attributes of business and industry. The supply depots could all be handled by private industry; and yet who would suggest that we abolish all of our supply depots? There are a lot of smaller items necessary to the overall military activities on every installation that have to be performed which are in the nature of business operations.

It was my purpose in proposing this section to the committee simply to provide the Congress the right to review these actions and to consider what would happen to the facilities for which we have appropriated millions and millions of dollars before permitting some administrative official to act indiscriminately upon his own private judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. VINSON) Mr. HARDY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentleman from Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that this provision is not the same provision that we had in the appropriation bill; it is not the same provision that we had in the point of order bill. This is simple language to give the Congress a chance to review actions which the Defense Department proposes. Actually the agency can now effectively nullify what we have already done under our legislative authority.

I want to call attention to another aspect. This section relates not only to proposals involving procurements by contract, but it also would require the Department of Defense to report proposals for performing with military personnel of functions which are currently being performed by civilians. If anybody has any notion that it is more economical to perform industrial type activities with military personnel than it is with civilians, they certainly have another thought coming to them. Some of you might be surprised to learn that not so long ago there were a number of areas in which the Defense Department discontinued the use of civilians in business type activities but continued the operation of those facilities by military personnel. The cost of operation with military personnel in every case I ever heard of is far in excess of the cost when civilians are used.

As I said before, I am perfectly willing to put this determination on an economy basis and a basis of national security. I have no political axe to grind and, so far as I know, it will have no political significance to me one way or the other, but I do think we have a responsibility to pass on the future use of construction and equipment items which we have heretofore authorized and for which we have heretofore appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will join me in opposing the pending amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

I had planned to offer a similar amendment to this section, but am very glad to support the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT].

A few weeks ago when we had the Defense Department appropriation bill before the committee, many Members came down into the well and undertook to justify a cut of \$2½ billion by claiming that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the different services could save vast amounts of money if they would just do it. What this section proposes is to nullify any substantial or real effort on the part of the Defense Department to get the Government out of competition with private business. A movement to get the Government out of competition with private enterprise would be a move in the direction of economy and in accordance with the pleas made by so many Members of this House just a few weeks ago.

If the amendment does not prevail and section 411 remains in the bill, it will mean that the Defense Department will not be able to terminate a commercial-type activity and procure the services terminated from private industry, if the service involves 10 or more employees, without filing a report of intention with both Houses of Congress and waiting on the expiration of 60 successive legislative days. It seems to me that that is an unreasonable requirement to be placed upon the Secretary of Defense and an unnecessary obligation to be imposed upon the Committees on Armed Services.

There are several reasons why this amendment is in my opinion necessary. First, it is an effort to cooperate with the Defense Department in practicing economy. Second, it is an effort to get the Government out of competition with private business. Third, most of the competing activities that would be involved are small business concerns in the localities where we have military installations. Many Members frequently proclaim their interest in small business, but this amendment will give all of us who wish to benefit and encourage small business enterprises an opportunity to strike a blow in their behalf. I believe a vote against this amendment will be a vote to obstruct the efforts of the Defense Department to get the Government out of competition with small business establishments in the areas of our country adjacent to military installations. Fourth, surely the Congress of the United States has more important duties to perform than to review every decision of the Defense Department which involves the closing down of strictly commercial or industrial-type activities in which 10 or more civilian employees are engaged.

I think we should spend our time and energy seeking to encourage Government agencies to get out of the business of competing with private enterprise, in cooperating with the Secretary of De-

fense in his effort to benefit and promote the interests of small business enterprises which suffer from this Government competition in and near defense installations, and in seeking ways and means to bring about more economies in Government. In my humble judgment, and of course I speak only for myself and recognize the right of others to disagree with me, if we fail to adopt this amendment and leave section 411 in the bill, we will be putting roadblocks in the path of the Secretary of Defense as he undertakes to bring about a more efficient and economical administration of our Defense Establishment.

I submit to the members of the committee that this is an amendment which should prevail and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in favor of section 411 as it stands in the bill. It has been mentioned by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] that this provision in the bill does not prevent the Defense Department from closing any activity but simply gives the Members of the Congress of the United States an opportunity to review the proposal to determine whether it meets with the approval of the Members of the Congress and, if it does, then the Defense Department can proceed.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I would just like to emphasize that point. Contrary to the impression of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], a moment ago, it does not require Congressional review of the matter. The gentleman knows as well as I do that there are very, very few that would ever even be presented to any committee for a study, looking toward a resolution against it; is that not correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Well, it does require congressional review by the committee if there is to be any veto.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. That, of course, is correct, if there is to be a veto. But, this language does not contemplate that every one of them would be reviewed or that there would be any effort made to veto.

Mr. JONAS. There is no reason to submit it to the House if the House is not to review it, then.

Mr. HARDY. I will say to the gentleman they certainly should have an opportunity to review it if there is any reason that any Member knows that it should be reviewed.

Mr. JONAS. But we would not know that unless we reviewed it. How would you know that unless you reviewed every proposal?

Mr. BALDWIN. May I say further that last week the Defense Department announced the proposed closing of some 50 or 60 installations in the United States. None of those closed, which involve no transfer of activity to commercial enterprise, would be affected by this amendment. As long as the Defense Department proposes simply to close an installation, not transfer it to commercial enterprise or industry, this amendment would not even apply. The Defense Department could proceed to close such an installation. The only thing this section does is to provide that where the Defense Department says "We are going to close this activity at a military installation and transfer it to some industry or some business," that we, the Congress, want to have the opportunity to study this to determine for ourselves whether it is advisable, and if we do not take positive action, then after 60 legislative days it goes into effect.

Let me give you an example. During World War II the Navy Department had been searching for years and years to try to find an answer to the problem of having naval ships come into drydock at too frequent intervals in order to have barnacles and fouling and everything else cleared off the bottoms of those ships. For years the Navy Department tried to find a solution to the problem, and at Mare Island Navy Yard they set up a paint mixing facility for the primary purpose of trying to find a solution to this problem, to find some kind of satisfactory type of paint that would enable those ships to stay out at their posts or wherever the fleet might be for a much longer time. During World War II they made a breakthrough on that problem and they were actually able to develop a type of paint that made it possible for naval vessels during World War II, in the great military stresses of that time, to stay out at sea for a period twice as long as ever before.

The paint industry had all the opportunity in the world for the previous 100 years to develop that type of paint, but they did not. It was only under the stress of the war emergency that the naval paint-mixing plant, with naval civilian employees, developed an answer to the problem. It was something that the commercial industry had no equivalent for. And yet today, the Navy Department, because of pressure from the Department of Defense, states that it intends to close that particular facility and to transfer the patents, and everything else, to commercial enterprise, without even knowing whether at the present time those commercial facilities can produce this special type of paint at a cost comparable to that for which the Navy today can produce that paint.

The Federal Government by action of previous Congresses has appropriated over \$1 million to build the facility, and yet, without even an opportunity for Congress to review the decision, the Department of Defense can simply say today that it is going to be closed down, that we are going to transfer the patents to commercial enterprise even though we do not know whether they can give

us the product at comparable cost or not.

This will give us a chance to look at such a proposal before we allow it to be done.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the Hardy amendment only retains in the Congress the constitutional prerogative which is vested in the Congress to provide a military establishment. If we want to abdicate our constitutional mandate and responsibility, we can turn it over to the Department of Defense. No other branch of the Government is directed, as is the Congress, to provide a military establishment. That is in the Constitution. If you want to abdicate that, that is your responsibility. This amendment says, "We will review before we close an establishment and then decide whether or not it should be brought to the attention of you gentlemen." If you do not want that, that suits me all right. I have no manufacturing in my district. I went through my files to find out whether I did.

There is a navy yard in my town. There is an airbase in my town. In my district is Parris Island. I have this letter.

Some time ago, about a year and a half ago, somebody told me that they were closing up an ice-cream plant at Parris Island. Sometimes they have 20,000 recruits at Parris Island. Now, the most insatiable appetite on earth is a boot marine's appetite after 12 hours of drilling. He will eat anything that does not bite him first. Among those things is ice cream. They had an ice-cream plant down at Parris Island. Somebody in the Defense Department said, "Let's put it out of business. This ice-cream plant is ruining the Government. It's a shame the way the Marines at Parris Island are competing with the private ice-cream industry in making ice cream, and giving it to those recruits. We will put a stop to that." And they did. That was over a year ago.

So I wrote one of these outstanding defense officials in the Defense Department and he wrote me back. I have the letter and I can read it to you verbatim, punctuation and literatum. He said they could get ice cream delivered at all the places on the east coast for \$1.10 a gallon. So they stopped it.

A little later on I was down at Parris Island and I saw Gen. Homer Litzenberg. I said, "General Litzenberg, what did it cost to make that ice cream you used to make down here?" He wrote me a letter. I think he is reliable. He is now commanding the United States Marines in Korea. I believe he can be depended on. I think he can pass the security test. He said:

The cost of this product over a 6-month period, including overhead, was 62 cents per gallon.

This was made at Parris Island.

The depot is now purchasing ice cream which conforms to South Carolina standards—

And there are none better—
at a contract price of \$1.35 per gallon.

He said they serve ice cream 2 or 3 times per week, compared to 5 or 7 servings a week before.

But they have got the Government out of business and the ice cream out of the stomachs of the Marines. That is the way they got the Government out of business. So, may I say to my great friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], there is one of his specific instances where the Government was making something a little cheaper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. May I ask the chairman of my committee, since he is not going to use his time, to give me a little time?

Mr. VINSON. I think the time is divided up.

Mr. RIVERS. I think the chairman has 3½ minutes. Is he going to use it?

Mr. VINSON. Do I have any time, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Three and a half minutes.

Mr. VINSON. I yield it with pleasure to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank my distinguished chairman.

I represent Americans just as you do, and they are kind of conservative people. If you look at my record, I do not run out here on some of these wild goose chases. People just do not do business like that in my country.

We have the oldest New England society in the South in Charleston, S. C. A fellow by the name of Daniel Webster and Calvin Coolidge have spoken to it. We have the oldest chamber of commerce in America in Charleston, S. C. The same chamber of commerce that sent you people those letters about getting the Government out of business sent it to me, but when I explained it to them they understood. They knew whereof we spoke. You trust our committee. If this amendment is retained in this bill—you do not think CARL VINSON, at whose feet I have sat for 17 years, like St. Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, is the kind of man who spends the Government's money foolishly. Do you think Mr. VINSON would look at these things in a perfunctory sort of manner? Mr. VINSON does not do business like that. I do not think our committee would come in to you and say, "Keep one of these things in PORTER HARDY's district and MENDEL RIVERS' district. They are pretty good fellows." This committee we have just would not do business like that.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. No one in this House could fail to say the gentleman from South Carolina is a good fellow. I should like to echo what the gentleman said a minute ago. There is not a more conservative nor a more patriotic Member of the House than the gentleman from Charleston. I follow him usually on this floor, but I cannot follow him with respect to this amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sorry.

We cannot afford to abdicate our constitutional responsibility. The military is the only branch of the Government where the Constitution says, "You provide it and the President will command it." If you want to abdicate your responsibility, that is your business. I am just not going to be counted among that group.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I, too, have a navy yard; and I checked one of these situations with reference to the substitution of private industry, so it was said, for historic military institutions. I found these substitutions were being made in the name of economy, but economy was not one of the factors which was used in the criteria.

Mr. RIVERS. That is correct. A lot of times it is favoritism. I am on a subcommittee that investigates all of the military, the Hébert committee. We find in these cost-plus and fixed-fee contracts, it costs much more—much more—many times more. If you want to talk about competition, we have a Boston Navy Yard and right close to them is the Bethlehem Steel Yard. Both yards build ships. If you do not need the Boston Navy Yard, then give the work to the Bethlehem Co. Closeby at Portsmouth, N. H., we have the Electric Boat Co. We have the Bath Iron Works up in Maine. You can do the same thing there, if you want to get the Government out of business. But when the bullets start flying, you had better look to these military installations because there are no bargains in security. You have to have it. I say to you, you need the Hardy amendment. It will save your military installations for when you have to have them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago following the enactment of the military appropriation bill for fiscal year 1955, the law provided that before the Department of Defense could dispose of any civilian-type activities, a report had to be made to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House and the comparable committee for the Senate. Under that law the two committees had to approve the proposed discontinuances. The Secretary of Defense submitted in the fiscal year, I think, about 60 proposals for the disposal of military civilian-type activities. Included were the Rope Walk up in Boston and a paint shop out in California. Those were fair-

ly extensive and important installations. Also included in the list were a number of cobbler shops, pressing shops, laundries and comparable smaller installations. This group of 15 on the subcommittee then spent, as I recall, about 2 weeks determining whether the Department of Defense should get rid of the laundries, several cobbler shops or some of these minor installations involving a minimum number of employees. It was the greatest and most complete waste of time I have ever experienced on that subcommittee because under that procedure the subcommittee was called upon to hamper and hinder the Defense officials in their effort to economize and rid the military of activities which were competitive with private enterprise.

Under the provision of this act, section 411, if there is a cobbler shop in any military installations of 10 or more employees—imagine a cobbler shop with 10 or more employees—the Defense Department has to file a report with the Speaker and the Vice President, and that report is then submitted to the House and the Senate Committees on Armed Services to determine whether they can get rid of a cobbler shop with 10 employees. It is a most ridiculous provision and a most wasteful procedure, timewise and otherwise, for the Congress.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I must of course yield to my distinguished friend and colleague.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask my distinguished friend if it is not true that the services should have some justification before they plan to close an installation and if they have that justification, all they have to do is to send it right over to the Congress. It is just one step more and it does not cost any more money.

Mr. FORD. May I say it seems to be on the verge of ridiculousness that such a report and such a study with recommendations has to be put together and then filed with the Vice President and with the Speaker of the House, and then has to be referred to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and his counterpart in the other body. To involve ourselves the Congress as a whole in the determination of a civilian competitive type installation with 10 employees is beyond my comprehension. That is the prerogative and responsibility of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. When they establish a project like this do they come to Congress and get justification for putting in a cobbler shop for instance?

Mr. FORD. I have never seen a line item in an authorization bill where they got authorization from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, to establish a cobbler shop in Fort Dix, Fort Devens, or any of the Navy or Air Force installations.

I urge the approval of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment that would strike out section 411 of this bill, H. R. 8240. Section 411 would require that prior to the termination of, or reduction in the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity being conducted on the date of the enactment of H. R. 8240, where such termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished by other than civilian employees of the United States, and where such activity has been conducted for 5 or more years and requires the services of 10 or more civilian employees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed termination or reduction. The section also provides that any proposed termination or reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of 60 days of continuous session of the Congress following the filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during such 60 days either House of the Congress has adopted a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed termination or reduction described in such report.

Mr. Chairman, I am more deeply concerned over this matter now than I was on May 12, 1955, when I took the floor in the first session of the 84th Congress to oppose a similar amendment that would strike section 639 from the Defense Appropriations bill for 1956, under consideration on that day.

My greater concern today stems from the fact that there seems to be a concerted effort on the part of some officials in the Department of the Defense and the Department of the Army to strip the Springfield Armory from its traditional role of rifle production for the Army and turn this production over to commercial industries who have neither the know-how nor the experience in this field.

As my colleagues know, the Army on May 1 last adopted the new M-14 rifle as its standard shoulder piece to replace the famous M-1 Garand rifle. Both of these rifles were developed at the Springfield Armory, one of the outstanding units in the Government's arsenal system. These are only two of the many rifles that have been developed and produced at the Springfield Armory since it was established by our first President, George Washington.

But now it appears that Defense Department policy will channel the M-14 rifle production into commercial plants, resulting in a loss to the country of highly trained and skilled personnel who have spent their lives developing and making rifles in the arsenal system. I have no problem with the Defense Department in this policy as it pertains to strictly commercial types activities. These should and are now being conducted by private enterprise. Cobbler shops, cleaning establishment, and a host of other commercial endeavors have been eliminated. This type of

commercial or industrial activity is better done by private business and small business. My quarrel is with any effort that would take the Army out of its legitimate role of producing the small weapons it alone uses. I hope that this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That rope walk up in Boston was supposed to have been closed 4 years ago. Does the gentleman know why you did not close it?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. I understood they were doing nothing but experimental work up there now. I do not know anything more about it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], whether or not it is not a fact that this provision as it has been inserted in the law has operated as a very effective bar against the Defense Department in attempting to get rid of some of these installations.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield, there is no doubt about it. It has slowed down the disposition of these installations and prevented small business from getting its share of the business.

Mr. TABER. I just want to go into this a moment. If the Secretary of Defense took a notion that he needed to close up one of these activities, no matter how small it was, as long as it had 10 employees, and he took a notion to do that on the 15th of August and Congress was in adjournment sine die, it would be impossible until the middle of March for the closing to take place. In other words, it would take a little over 6 months in that kind of a situation. It would mean that the Defense Department would have to be up before the Armed Services Committee almost every day on some such program as this. I do not know how the Armed Services Committee would enjoy it. Frankly, I am afraid that they would get a little more than they bargained for, because this is an item that is deliberately designed to prevent the armed services from saving money. God knows the United States of America and the Military Establishment needs to save money so that we can have what is necessary to maintain the defense of the United States.

I hope that this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Is not the purport of this amendment to keep the Government in business when the House and the Congress have repeatedly voted to take it out of business?

We should reach some stable position on this amendment and remain there rather than voting one way one session and the other way the next. Both the committee and our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] I have been on both sides of the

question. The last time this amendment was up, the gentleman from Georgia told the House he was opposed to it because it put the Government back in business.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. We have had that situation up here time after time during the past several years, and we know it is not the way to do business.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman referred to the amendment. He meant the section, I think.

Mr. TABER. That is right. He meant the language in the bill. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

(Mr. GRIFFIN was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to register my wholehearted support of the amendment to strike out section 411 as offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

This amendment, if adopted, will help to carry out the spirit as well as the letter of the Hoover Commission recommendations to get the Federal Government out of business activities competing with private enterprise whenever possible consistent with economy and national security.

The great majority of people of this Nation want economy. They want the elimination of waste and of needless expense wherever possible.

Adoption of the Arends amendment will enable the Defense Department to save thousands of dollars and will result in the transfer of civilian-type commercial activities to small business and to free enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think we are all talking to the same end, but are approaching it by different ways. I want to save some money for the taxpayers. That is why I think this amendment should be defeated. We have heard a lot about the limitation of 10 men, but no one has said it only applies to those facilities that have been in existence over 5 years or more by that time they certainly have proven their worth. I am not too certain, because I have not investigated the practices in other parts of the country, that the situation as delineated by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has not existed as the result of trying to get the Government out of certain types of business that are essential to the armed services. I know it took place in the dry cleaning work in my district and the result is that the enlisted men and the officers are paying more for their dry cleaning its laundry and dry cleaning today than and the Government is paying more for they paid when the Government was doing it. If the Government can do the job better under any circumstances the

Government is entitled to do the job in the interest of economy of government.

We have been through some of this; we know that it can be done cheaper. In the matter of the reference of these matters back to the committee, we have it in all real estate transactions no matter how small, even to the granting of a simple easement; such a transaction must come before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I congratulate the gentleman from California on his statement. I would like to emphasize that this same procedure is regularly called for in a number of matters, and so far as I know there has been no criticism of it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Not only that, but on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries we require the submission of certain real estate transactions and their study by the committee in order to protect the Government's interest in wildlife refuges.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from California is making a very good statement. I am sure the gentleman would agree with me that when any agency of Government spends over half the total budget the Congress should keep an eye on what is going on, should have a check on spending.

At the time when a similar provision was in effect the Department of Defense sent up to, at that time the Appropriations Committee, a proposal to discontinue 112 activities. The committee spent only a short time, as I recall, 2 or 3 days—maybe a little longer—screening that and allowed all but 4 of the recommendations of the Department of Defense to stand.

It is our position that by having it in effect the Government was much more careful in determining what could properly be permitted.

Mr. MILLER of California. Certainly. We cannot afford to tie the hands of the Government too tightly in these instances. May I say again: Those services the Government can render cheaper than private industry it should be allowed to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, all time for debate has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARENDS. There has been a little confusion as to what the parliamentary situation is on this amendment. A vote in support of the amendment means to strike section 411 from the bill; an affirmative vote on the amendment means striking section 411 from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ARENDS and Mr. HARDY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 309, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Arends amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them engross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 70, line 17, strike out all of section 411, beginning line 17 on page 70, through line 16 on page 71.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced the ayes had it.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. If that is done, we will not have a vote on the amendment until Wednesday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this matter go over until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

USURPATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS BY THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. HUDDLESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, we Southerners have long recognized the increasing tendency of the United States Supreme Court to usurp the legislative powers of Congress. With growing alarm and distress, we have witnessed, time and again, the Court's overstepping its judicial authority and invading the legislative field. For years, the South's protests have gone unanswered and unheeded as mere voices in the wilderness. Now, the severity of this situation is finally coming to the attention of the American people. The entire Nation is

awakening to the inherent dangers which our system of government now faces because of recent Supreme Court decisions.

Our American Government draws its strength from a system of checks and balances set up by the Constitution. This system is workable only when each of the three branches of Government—the executive, legislative, and judicial—has equal but separate powers. Obviously, any deviation tending to give one branch more authority than the others would result in a change in the very essence of our Government. This dire consequence was perhaps seen from the very beginning of our Government, for Washington warned in his Farewell Address: "But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

During the last 4 years the Court has handed down more than a score of decisions which usurp the power of the legislative branch to make the laws of the land. The school segregation cases of May 1954, the Steve Nelson sedition case of April 1956, and the recent decisions affecting Communists are cases in point. A cursory examination will indicate that these cases represent a gross invasion of the legislative authority vested in Congress by the Constitution and a usurpation of power on the part of the Supreme Court.

By successively limiting or denying the legislative powers of Congress, the Supreme Court has recently been taking over a lion's share of governmental functions and responsibility. This tendency did not cause widespread concern of a national nature until the present term of court, when 16 far-reaching and provocative decisions have been handed down. While it is regrettable that the Court, in decision after decision, has been allowed to continue with this practice of usurpation of congressional authority, it is gratifying to see Representatives and Senator from all sections of the Nation aroused by the seriousness of the situation.

Four of the Supreme Court's most significant and alarming decisions came on the same day, June 17, 1957. At this same setting, the Court:

First, in the California Communists cases, upheld the right of anyone to preach the overthrow of the Government "intellectually," so long as specific action is not advocated, thus drastically limiting the scope of the Smith Act, which, as you know, is a Federal law dealing with sedition;

Second, in the Watkins case, limited the power of congressional committees to investigate;

Third, in the Service case, restricted the power of Government officials to discharge employees for security reasons; and

Fourth, in the Sweezy case limited the power of States to require witnesses to testify in investigations.

Just 2 weeks earlier, the Supreme Court denied a case which really lifted the lid. In upholding the appeal of Clinton E. Jencks, New Mexico Commu-

nist, the Court ruled that reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other Government agencies must be turned over to defendants in criminal trials if persons who made the reports are called as witnesses. It was this file-opening move which really stirred the American people to action.

This trend of decisions nullifying and vitiating the attempts of Congress to legislate is not new. The trend dates back several years. In the Steve Nelson case of last year, the Court held that State laws on sedition were invalid since the Smith Act, a Federal law dealing with the same, superseded any State law. In applying this preemption doctrine the Court wrote into the law certain provisions which, it is patent, were not intended by the Congress in enacting the law. The Court was thereby constituting itself as a legislative body in promulgating laws in violation of Article I of the Constitution. This article declares that Congress shall have "all legislative powers." In the school segregation cases, the Court sought to give birth to an additional constitutional amendment without its first having been proposed by Congress and in violation of Article V of the Constitution. Article V provides that amendments to the Constitution shall be proposed by Congress. The law at the time of those decisions was well established that the doctrine of separate but equal educational facilities complied with the provisions of the 14th amendment. The Court, in ruling as it did in those cases, in effect adopted an additional amendment, for the decisions were contrary to the established law of over 100 years.

Congress was never intended to be subservient to the Supreme Court. The power of Congress to legislate cannot be hamstrung except in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution itself. It is becoming more and more evident that action must be taken in the Congress to correct these legislative abuses and usurpations.

Our only recourse is remedial legislation.

Last year, I introduced legislation which would reestablish and reaffirm the basic constitutional doctrine of the separation of powers between the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government. My bill aroused considerable interest when it was introduced late in the last session. I have again introduced it in the 85th Congress as H. R. 692, which is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

There can be no denying that a serious situation exists when the Supreme Court usurps the constitutional authority of Congress and exercises legislative functions through judicial decree. As Washington warned in his Farewell Address, any usurpation of power which goes unchallenged can become a weapon by which our Government may be destroyed.

It would certainly appear, Mr. Speaker, that these abuses by the Court can result only in sounding the death knell of our constitutional system of Government. It is high time that we

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 11, 1957
For actions of July 10, 1957
85th-1st, No. 120

CONTENTS

Advisory committees.....1	Forestry.....17,30	Poultry.....23
Barter.....12	Grain storage.....32	Public Law 480.....3,12
Cheese.....24	Holidays.....21	Reclamation.....5,13
Committees.....27	Lands.....6,28	Reorganization.....2
Conservation.....22,33	Labor, farm.....4	Research.....25
Cost of living.....8	Legislative program...9,18	Soil bank.....11
Disaster relief.....11	Livestock.....26	Surplus commodities.....12
Electrification.....16,19	Loans.....9,11	Tobacco.....34
Federal-State relations.14	Military construction...3	Trade, foreign.....12
Feed.....11	Mining.....6	Travel.....29
Fiscal policies.....15	Monopolies.....24,26	Water.....16,25
Food additives.....31	Nomination.....10	Wildlife.....33
Foreign aid.....7,20		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bills to: Establish standards for advisory committees. Extend Reorganization Act. Sen. Humphrey urged greater use of barter under Public Law 480. Senate received nomination of Paarlberg to be member of CCC board. Sen. Humphrey urged greater USDA aid for flood disaster relief in Minn..

HOUSE

1. ADVISORY COMMITTEES. Passed, with amendments, H.R. 7390, to provide certain standards for the establishment and utilization of Government advisory committees. (pp. 10134-35, 10138-53)
Agreed to the following amendments:
By Rep. Brown, Ohio, to permit advisory committee meetings to be "conducted in the presence of" a Federal employee, rather than restricting the conduct of meetings to "under the chairmanship" of a Federal employee. (p. 10147)
By Rep. Brown, Ohio, to require only "minutes" rather than "full and complete minutes" to be kept of advisory committee meetings. (pp. 10147-48)
By Rep. Brown, Ohio, to exempt committees authorized by "statutory" law from the provisions of the bill. (p. 10148)
By Rep. Halleck, to strike out the time requirement that an agency must notify both Houses of Congress "not less than 30 days" before an advisory committee is established. (pp. 10150-52)
A motion by Rep. Hoffman to recommit the bill was rejected 183 to 225.
2. REORGANIZATION. Passed as reported H.R. 8364, to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so as to extend the period for transmitting reorganization plans to Congress for 2 years to June 1, 1959, and to provide that plans transmitted may be disapproved by a simple majority vote of either the House or the Senate

instead of an authorized majority of either House as provided by present law. A motion by Rep. Hoffman to recommit the bill was rejected 44 to 336. The language of H.R. 8364 as passed was substituted for the language of S. 1791, a similar bill. H.R. 8364 was laid on the table. pp. 10136-37, 10154-59

3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Passed with amendments H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including a provision for the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries. pp. 10133-34
 4. FARM LABOR. The Judiciary Committee issued a report "pertaining to Japanese agricultural workers." (H. Rept. 780). p. 10170
 5. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H.R. 4410, to suspend and to modify the application of the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to lands in the E. Bench unit of the Mo. River Basin project. (H. Rept. 783). p. 10170
 6. PUBLIC LANDS. Both Houses received from Interior a proposed bill "to amend law relating to mining leases on Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations;" to Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. pp. 10170, 10065
 7. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Bow criticized administration of the foreign aid program. pp. 10163-69
 8. COST OF LIVING. Rep. Vursell spoke on the danger of inflation, and urged voluntary action by industry to "seek to stabilize and reduce their prices whenever possible, and use their influence to reduce the cost of living." pp. 10161-63
 9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that H.R. 3753, to extend loans to desert-land entrymen, would be considered today, July 11. p. 10160
- SENATE
10. NOMINATIONS. Received the nomination of Don Paarlberg to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. p. 10125
 11. DISASTER RELIEF. Sen. Humphrey discussed the action he has urged on this Department to aid in flood disaster relief in Minn., including FHA emergency loans, use of feed from soil bank acres, subsidization of feed buying, special ACP payments, and extension of long term loans. pp. 10076-7
 12. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Sen. Humphrey inserted an article, "Food For Freedom," urging a greater use of food as an instrument of foreign policy. p. 10081
Sen. Humphrey discussed the use of barter agreements under the Public Law 480 program, and urged more extensive development of such exchanges. pp. 10114-18
 13. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 2120, authorizing construction of the Mercedes Division, lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project (S. Rept. 603). p. 10067
 14. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Sen. Carlson inserted the resolutions of the Governor's Conference of 1957. pp. 10065-7

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 135 I am recorded as having been absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 127, on June 27, on the vote on the motion to recommit the bill S. 1428, I was recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8240, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole on which a separate vote was demanded.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: On page 70, strike out all of section 411 beginning on line 17 and extending through line 16 of page 71.

(Mr. TEWES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, we Members are frequently surprised by the inability of our constituents to understand the activities of Congress. It seems to me that a provision such as section 411 in this bill is a prime example of the kind of legislation which few people will understand. It is so patently contrary to the viewpoints of the average man that its passage will certainly leave him wondering.

Section 411 requires Congress to review every single attempt of the Defense Department to divest itself of a Government-operated business employing 10 or more people. The intent of the section is to give Members a veto in an administrative matter which conceivably could affect their district. It is intended to give Members a voice in a matter which can actually be handled much better by the Defense Department.

This section thereby opens the door to many considerations except the really important one of getting the Government out of private business. Moreover it serves not as only temporary bar to removing the Government from business, but it permanently stymies the whole program. Congressional review will certainly be filled with extraneous considerations, including politics. Under the proposals of this section the Defense Department is virtually stripped

of authority urgently recommended by the Hoover Commission.

During the last political campaign and on the floor of the House there has been a great deal of oratory concerning the plight of the small-business man. Here is an opportunity to make good on campaign promises. It can be done by vigorously supporting the amendment to strike section 411.

It has been said that the section referred to is an economy measure. Whatever economy there may be in having a Government business which pays no taxes is economy at the expense of the small-business man. Furthermore, the small savings claimed would be more than offset by the ridiculous cost of 435 Members of Congress busily arguing whether a paint shop employing 10 people should be closed.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment to strike section 411 should be adopted because, first, it is an economy measure which helps to get the Government out of unnecessary activities; second, it cuts through the welter of administrative details which are really unworthy of the time of the House of Representatives; and, third, it aids small-business men by returning to them functions which they can better perform.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 230, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—183

Abbitt	Cole	Harvey
Alger	Collier	Haskell
Allen, Ill.	Corbett	Henderson
Andersen,	Cramer	Heseltun
H. Carl	Cretella	Hess
Arends	Cunningham,	Hiestand
Auchincloss	Iowa	Hill
Avery	Cunningham,	Hillings
Ayres	Nebr.	Hoeven
Baker	Curtin	Hoffman
Bass, N. H.	Curtis, Mo.	Holt
Baumhart	Dague	Horan
Becker	Dawson, Utah	Jackson
Belcher	Dellay	James
Bennett, Mich.	Dennison	Jarman
Bentley	Derounian	Jenkins
Berry	Devereux	Jensen
Betts	Dies	Johansen
Bolton	Dixon	Jonas
Bow	Dooley	Judd
Boyle	Dowdy	Kean
Broomfield	Dwyer	Kearney
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	Keating
Brownson	Ford	Keeney
Budge	Frelinghuysen	Kilburn
Bush	Gary	Knox
Byrne, Ill.	Gavin	Krueger
Byrnes, Wis.	George	Laird
Canfield	Griffin	Latham
Cannon	Gross	LeCompte
Carrigg	Gubser	Lipscomb
Cederberg	Gwinn	McCulloch
Chamberlain	Hale	McDonough
Chenoweth	Halleck	McGregor
Chiperfield	Harden	McIntire
Church	Harrison, Nebr.	McIntosh
Clevenger	Harrison, Va.	McVey

Mack, Wash.
Mahon
Martin
Mason
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morano
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nicholson
Nimtz
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patterson
Pillion
Poage

Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehman
Robeson, Va.
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.

Smith, Wis.
Springer
Staufner
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Tewes
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Younger

NAYS—230

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baldwin
Barden
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bosch
Bray
Breeding
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Broyhill
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester

Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gathings
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Hardy
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Herlong
Hollifield
Holland
Holmes
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jennings
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knutson
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Long
Loser
McCarty
McCormack
McFall
McGovern
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Marshall
Matthews
Merrrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Montoya
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss

Multer
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Polk
Porter
Preston
Price
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rohney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Santangelo
Saund
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scott, Pa.
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Ia.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Whitener
Whitten
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—20

Adair	Bowler	Moulder
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	O'Konski
Anderson,	Coudert	Powell
Mont.	Dawson, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Andresen,	Holtzman	Teller
August H.	Kearns	Thornberry
Beamer	McConnell	
Blitch	Maillard	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Teller against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Maillard.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. TEAGUE of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 296 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7390) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself at this time such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 296 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 7390 to amend the Administrative Ex-

penses Act of 1946. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate on the bill.

The bill provides certain standards for the establishment and utilization of advisory committees within the Government. At the present time it is estimated that there are between seventeen and eighteen hundred advisory committees which would be subject to the provisions of this legislation.

Provision is made for a department to send written notice to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate 30 days prior to the establishment of an advisory committee or panel. The report must show the authority for the creation of the committee; that its establishment would be in the public interest; the number of members to serve and the area of interest each member will represent. Further, the report must show the members who will, and will not, receive compensation; what expenses will be paid by the Government, and how long it is expected the committee will function.

The bill requires that the agenda for a committee will be formulated, or approved, by full-time salaried officials of the Government; that the chairman shall be a full-time salaried official of the Government; full and complete minutes of the meetings must be kept, and the use of such committees is limited to purely advisory functions.

Finally, the President is authorized to issue regulations, consistent with the standards provided in the bill, which he deems necessary for the effective control and use of these committees, and also cause to be prepared annually a full report showing the membership of each committee used by each department, the functions of each committee and the extent to which the operations of each committee has complied with the above-listed standards.

The resolution provides ample time for a full discussion by the House of the provisions of the bill. I therefore urge the adoption of this resolution so the House may proceed to the bill, H. R. 7390.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, after lengthy hearings before the Committee on Rules I am convinced that this is not a good bill and should be defeated. Nevertheless, I am not inclined to fight the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has explained, this bill deals with the advisory committees now in existence within the executive branch of the Government. It would amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 so as to add certain new sections which would require the various agencies of Government establishing in the future advisory committees to so report to Congress and to furnish certain other information. The bill would further place upon the different agencies, branches and departments of the Gov-

ernment the responsibility of providing or furnishing the agenda for the meetings of these advisory committees, and would require that they be held either under the chairmanship of, or, as I shall offer an amendment, in the presence of, a representative and fulltime employee of the Government. In the past, as will be explained later in general debate, there have been some rather peculiar developments in the past showing that there has been a conflict of interest so far as the membership of some of these advisory committees is concerned. This legislation would give the Congress, and its appropriate committees, an opportunity to know just what advisory committees we may have, and just what their duties and responsibilities may be, and to make available to the Congress, when necessary, the minutes of the meetings which are held by these advisory committees. I am sure you are going to be told, before this debate is over, that a number of agencies and departments of Government are opposed to this legislation. I think that is correct. If I recall the testimony before our committee correctly, there is one department of Government that has over 600 of these advisory groups. However, the Comptroller General's office, which is a branch of the Congress, and represents the Congress, in checking all different activities and expenditures of the Government, came out for and testified in favor of this bill. That office wants some opportunity to know just what these advisory committees are, and something of what they are doing, and how much money they are spending from the Federal taxpayers' purse, and to have such other information as will permit both the Congress and the President himself, to keep abreast of what is going on in these various advisory agencies.

I have gone over this bill rather carefully. I sat with the subcommittee and heard the testimony on it. I heard the testimony for and against the bill. I am going to propose 2 or 3 amendments—3, in fact, to the measure. If you will check with me, on page 3 at the end of line 5, where the bill now provides meetings are to be held by these advisory committees under the chairmanship of a representative of the Government, I will attempt to add the words "or conducted in the presence of" a representative and fulltime salaried officer and employee of the Federal Government—just so the Government itself knows or at least some responsible person in the employ of the Government knows what the advisory committee may be doing.

Then on the same page, page 3, line 8, at the beginning of that line, I will offer an amendment to delete the words "Full and complete" and to start the sentence there with the word "Minutes" so that the language will read:

Minutes of each meeting of such advisory committee shall be kept, which shall contain at a minimum, (A) the name of each member of such advisory committee attending such meeting, (B) a summary of the matters discussed in such meeting stating the viewpoints expressed—

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
7 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
8 tion, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following
9 projects:

1 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES
2 TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES
3 (Ordnance Corps)

4 Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
5 \$2,288,000.

6 Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,-
7 000.

8 Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,-
9 000.

10 Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
11 and utilities, \$758,000.

12 Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
13 \$249,000.

14 White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
16 development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
17 ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,-
18 530,000.

19 (Quartermaster Corps)

20 Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
21 land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

22 New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
23 tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

24 Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
25 ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

1 Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:
2 Land acquisition, \$40,000.

3 Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,
4 and utilities, \$110,000.

5 Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,
6 and land acquisition, \$95,000.

7 (Chemical Corps)

8 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-
10 000.

11 (Signal Corps)

12 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

13 (Corps of Engineers)

14 Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-
15 search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

16 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training
17 facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

18 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
19 000.

20 (Transportation Corps)

21 Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
22 \$1,169,000.

23 Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
24 facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
14 utilities, \$4,859,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,703,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

1 (Fifth Army Area)

2 Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

3 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

4 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance
5 facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

6 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing,
7 \$4,663,000.

8 (Sixth Army Area)

9 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance
10 facilities, administrative facilities, community facility,
11 and utilities, \$1,487,000.

12 Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance
13 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,231,000.

14 (Military Academy)

15 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
16 York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

17 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

18 Various installations: Operational facility, community
19 facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

20 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

21 Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance fa-
22 cilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community
23 facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities,
24 \$8,466,000.

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
5 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
6 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
7 military tactical installations for assignment as public
8 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
9 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
10 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
11 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
12 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
13 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
14 structed with appropriated funds.

15 SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
16 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
17 STATES" in section 101, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
19 TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,
20 Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,212,000".

22 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
2 502 the amounts “\$44,003,000” and “\$133,671,000” and
3 inserting in place thereof “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,-
4 000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
6 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
7 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

8 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
9 TIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Department of the
10 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
11 land, strike out “\$2,360,000” and insert in place thereof
12 “\$3,137,000”.

13 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
14 (Military Academy)” with respect to United States Military
15 Academy, New York, strike out “\$9,950,000” and insert
16 in place thereof “\$11,983,000”.

17 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts “\$129,096,000” and “\$236,060,000”
20 and inserting in place thereof “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,-
21 870,000”, respectively.

1 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
2 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
3 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

4 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
5 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

6 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,
7 Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place
8 thereof "\$2,039,000".

9 (2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
10 York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$212,000".

12 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
13 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee,
14 Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof
15 "\$9,874,000".

16 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
17 TIES (Chemical Corps)"—

18 (1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,
19 strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof
20 "\$525,000".

21 (2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,
22 Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place
23 thereof "\$1,491,000".

24 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
25 TIES (Transportation Corps)"—

1 (1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New
2 York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place
3 thereof "\$1,240,000".

4 (2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike
5 out "\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,-
6 072,000".

7 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Med-
8 ical Corps)"—

9 (1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
10 Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof
11 "\$876,000".

12 (2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash-
13 ington, strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof
14 "\$669,000".

15 (3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
16 Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000"
17 and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

18 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sec-
19 ond Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Mary-
20 land, strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$800,000".

22 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
23 (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, South
24 Carolina, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof
25 "\$10,400,000".

1 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
2 (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
3 strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof
4 "\$14,283,000".

5 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
6 (Fifth Army Area)"—

7 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
8 out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,-
9 000".

10 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
11 strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$9,893,000".

13 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
14 out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

15 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
16 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect
17 to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert
18 in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
21 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "Alaskan Area"—with respect to
23 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$559,000".

25 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
 2 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and
 3 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$240,220,-
 4 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$549,287,000”, respectively.

5 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress
 6 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
 7 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

8 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
 9 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

10 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
 11 York, strike out “\$88,000” and insert in place thereof
 12 “\$136,000”.

13 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
 14 strike out “\$6,159,000” and insert in place thereof
 15 “\$8,593,000”.

16 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
 17 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—

18 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
 19 out “\$832,000” and insert in place thereof “\$984,000”.

20 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
 21 Texas, strike out “\$1,285,000” and insert in place
 22 thereof “\$1,847,000”.

23 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES”—

24 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
 25 “\$5,301,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,293,000”.

1 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
2 "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

3 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
4 strike out “\$1,092,000” and insert in place thereof
5 “\$1,373,000”.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, “\$200,783,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$203,331,000”.

9 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
10 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
11 tion 402 the amounts “\$86,916,000”, “\$200,783,000”, and
12 “\$323,462,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$95,010,-
13 000”, “\$203,331,000”, and “\$334,104,000”, respectively.

14 TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

21 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

23 Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis,
24 Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

1 Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock
2 \$25,438,000.

3 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
4 \$1,452,000.

5 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland:
6 Utilities, \$115,000.

7 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
8 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$1,500,000.

9 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
10 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

11 Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,-
12 998,000.

13 Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
14 facilities, \$391,000.

15 **FLEET BASE FACILITIES**

16 Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,
17 \$1,326,000.

18 Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
19 facilities, \$544,000.

20 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
21 community facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

22 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
23 \$7,808,000.

1 AVIATION FACILITIES

2 (Naval Air Training Stations)

3 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Opera-
4 tional facilities, \$566,000.

5 Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational
6 facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

7 Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

8 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-
9 tional facilities, (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

10 Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
11 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,-
12 067,000.

13 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana:
14 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational
16 facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,-
17 225,000.

18 Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida:
19 Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
20 \$39,000.

21 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

22 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational
23 facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

24 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational
25 facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
2 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
3 \$7,751,000.

4 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Califor-
5 nia: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
6 \$39,000.

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:
8 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

9 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:
10 Operational facilities, messhall, and land acquisition,
11 \$4,774,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-
13 ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

14 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
15 Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,
16 and utilities, \$5,728,000.

17 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
18 facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational
20 facilities, (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

21 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
22 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

23 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
24 tional facilities, \$384,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
2 cilities, \$3,401,000.

3 Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
4 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

5 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
6 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

7 Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and
8 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
9 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
11 tional facilities, (aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

12 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,
13 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
14 utilities, \$9,448,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Op-
16 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

17 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South
Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

21 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
22 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
23 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$6,503,000.

1 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-
2 tional facilities, \$3,620,000.

3 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California:
4 Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

5 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
6 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

7 (Special Purpose Air Stations)

8 Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsyl-
9 vania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

10 Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-
11 tional facilities, \$2,209,000.

12 Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:
13 Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San
14 Nicolas Island), \$3,479,000.

15 Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field (location
16 to be determined): Land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

17 SUPPLY FACILITIES

18 Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Admin-
19 istrative facilities, \$92,000.

20 Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Penn-
21 sylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

22 Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ad-
23 ministrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,001,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$4,256,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utilities, \$316,000.

1 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
2 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

3 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
4 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

5 Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
6 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

7 Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Mary-
8 land: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

9 Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance
10 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

11 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

12 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory
13 foundations, \$1,602,000.

14 Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, South Carolina:
15 Troop housing, \$1,225,000.

16 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training
17 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

18 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training
19 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,375,000.

20 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

21 Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-
22 ational facilities, \$443,000.

23 Naval Communication Station, Newport, Rhode Island:
24 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

1 Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:
2 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

3 Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Op-
4 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

5 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Op-
6 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

7 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

8 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
9 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

10 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

11 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
12 000.

13 Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
14 244,000.

15 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,
16 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
17 \$759,000.

18 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

19 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

20 Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
21 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
22 076,000.

23 Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
24 Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and
25 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

1 Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
2 Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
3 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

4 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

5 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
6 munity facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

7 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
8 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administration facilities and
9 utilities, \$332,000.

10 Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,-
11 699,000.

12 Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
13 000.

14 AVIATION FACILITIES

15 Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
16 erational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,-
17 000.

18 Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and
19 community facilities, \$1,793,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
21 Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),
22 \$2,088,000.

23 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-
24 lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba : Operational
2 facilities, \$5,730,000.

3 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
4 tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

5 Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
6 facilities (Tactical air navigation facilities), \$69,000.

7 Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
8 Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),
9 \$69,000.

10 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities at White Beach, \$504,000.

12 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Oper-
13 ational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-
14 ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

15 SUPPLY FACILITIES

16 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
17 \$1,550,000.

18 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
19 facilities, \$884,000.

20 Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
21 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000

22 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

23 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
24 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
25 \$904,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$898,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities, \$69,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, southern Japan: Operational facilities, housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$726,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$1,093,000.

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent

1 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
2 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
3 total amount of \$65,091,000.

4 SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
5 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-
6 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

7 Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES",
8 with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000"
9 and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

10 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
11 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-
12 397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

13 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of
15 section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,-
16 000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in
17 place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and
18 "\$266,927,000".

19 SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
20 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
21 UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

22 Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with
23 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Cali-
24 fornia, strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof
25 "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station,

1 El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the Naval
3 Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and
4 insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
6 amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-
7 358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

8 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
9 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
10 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-
11 807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,-
12 555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

13 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
14 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
15 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

16 (1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,
17 with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Cali-
18 fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof
19 “\$1,099,000”.

20 (2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
21 with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out
22 “\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.

23 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
24 (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
25 Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out “\$3,686,

1 000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with
2 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia,
3 Louisiana, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place
4 thereof "\$26,871,000".

5 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
6 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
7 Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000"
8 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
9 the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
10 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
11 and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,
12 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
13 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

14 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
15 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
16 Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,-
17 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

18 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
19 with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,
20 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
21 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval
22 Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out
23 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

24 (7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACIL-
25 TIES" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian

1 Head, Maryland, strike out “\$780,000” and insert in place
2 thereof “\$879,000”.

3 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
5 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

6 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”
7 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajelein, Marshall
8 Islands, strike out “\$4,411,000” and insert in place thereof
9 “\$5,235,000”.

10 (2) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATION FACILI-
11 TIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
12 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out “\$2,848,600” and
13 insert in place thereof “\$3,198,600”.

14 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
15 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 “\$151,-
16 342,400” and inserting in place thereof “\$152,763,400”.

17 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
19 tion 502 the amounts “\$299,512,600”, “\$107,191,300”,
20 “\$151,342,400”, and “\$564,046,300” and inserting re-
21 spectively in place thereof “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”,
22 “\$152,763,400”, and “\$575,592,300”.

23 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
24 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
25 STATES” in section 201, as follows:

1 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
2 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-
3 lina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof
4 "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
5 Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in
6 place thereof "\$8,169,000".

7 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
8 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
9 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
10 623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
11 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$3,340,000".

13 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
14 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
15 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000"
16 and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

17 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
18 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
19 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
20 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

21 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
22 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
23 land, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof
24 "\$10,919,000".

25 (6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-

1 TIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
2 San Francisco, California, strike out "\$2,029,000" and in-
3 sert in place thereof "\$3,779,000".

4 (7) Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
5 TIES", with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
6 Virginia, strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof
7 "\$500,000".

8 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
9 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES"
10 in section 201, as follows:

11 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES",
12 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
13 out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

14 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
15 amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and
16 inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

17 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
18 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
19 amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000",
20 and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place
21 thereof "\$303,453,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000",
22 and "\$451,393,000".

23 TITLE III

24 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
25 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-

1 ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
2 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
3 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
4 ing projects:

5 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

6 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

7 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
9 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
10 \$4,499,000.

11 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Op-
12 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
13 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

14 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facili-
15 ties, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and
16 land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

17 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family
20 housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
21 provements, \$2,048,000.

22 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
23 Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
24 cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community
25 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

1 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
4 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

5 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
6 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

8 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
9 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
10 ground improvements, \$429,000.

11 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
13 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$905,000.

15 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
16 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
17 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
18 \$1,299,000.

19 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
21 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

22 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
23 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

24 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
3 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
4 ments, \$6,804,000.

5 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
6 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

8 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
9 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
10 and ground improvements, \$2,074,000.

11 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-
12 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
13 troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
14 improvements, \$2,082,000.

15 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land ac-
16 quisition, \$136,000.

17 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
19 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
20 \$4,328,000.

21 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
22 Community facilities, \$244,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
24 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
25 ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

1 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
2 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
3 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

4 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

6 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply
7 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
8 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

9 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
10 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
11 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

12 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
13 utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real
14 estate improvements, \$1,128,000.

15 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

18 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
20 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
21 and ground improvements, \$2,909,000.

22 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
23 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$358,000.

25 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
2 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
3 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
4 sition, \$48,178,000.

5 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

6 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
7 housing, \$405,000.

8 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
10 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
11 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
12 and land acquisition, \$10,659,000.

13 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
14 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

15 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
16 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
17 \$899,000.

18 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
19 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

20 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
24 ments, \$5,133,000.

1 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
 2 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

3 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
 4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
 5 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
 6 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

7 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:
 8 Community facilities, \$56,000.

9 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
 10 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop
 11 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

12 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:
 13 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
 14 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
 15 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
 16 \$2,077,000.

17 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

18 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research
 19 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community
 20 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
 21 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-
 24 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test

1 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
2 provements, \$1,987,000.

3 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
4 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
5 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
6 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

7 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
8 Community facilities, \$206,000.

9 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
10 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
11 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

12 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
15 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
16 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

17 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
18 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
19 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
20 improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,962,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
23 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
24 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
25 and land acquisition, \$4,785,000.

1 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

3 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
5 \$489,000.

6 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
7 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

8 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
9 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
10 ties, \$2,209,000.

11 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
12 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
13 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

14 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
17 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

18 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

21 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
23 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

24 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
25 facilities, \$436,000.

1 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

3 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

6 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
8 \$5,909,000.

9 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Utilities and
10 ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate
11 improvements, \$653,000.

12 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
15 \$4,200,000.

16 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
17 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

18 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
20 \$1,977,000.

21 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements,
24 \$4,118,000.

25 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-

1 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$865,000.

3 AIR UNIVERSITY

4 Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land
5 acquisition, \$50,000.

6 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

7 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical
8 facilities, \$952,000.

9 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

11 Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-
12 ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
13 \$337,000.

14 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

15 Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,
16 Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

17 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
18 Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

19 Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-
20 lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$2,216,000.

22 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$2,089,000.

25 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

1 Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
2 and land acquisition, \$496,000.

3 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

4 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
5 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
6 facilities, \$848,000.

7 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
10 \$3,344,000.

11 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
13 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

15 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
16 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
17 facilities, \$1,487,000.

18 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$5,557,000.

21 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
22 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
23 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
24 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

25 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$9,584,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground
9 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
10 ments, \$2,976,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

24 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
25 and training facilities, \$250,000.

1 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
2 acquisition, \$37,000.

3 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

6 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
8 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

9 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
11 ground improvements, \$936,000.

12 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
13 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

15 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

17 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
18 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

20 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

24 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:

1 Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$231,000.

3 Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-
4 shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

6 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
8 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
9 \$3,892,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,528,000.

14 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

17 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

21 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
22 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$1,901,000.

25 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-

1 ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$235,000.

3 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

4 Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Mainte-
5 nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, com-
6 munity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
7 acquisition, \$2,149,000.

8 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
9 Operational and training facilities, troop housing and com-
10 munity facilities, \$1,287,000.

11 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop
12 housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,-
13 558,000.

14 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
15 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land ac-
16 quisition, \$760,000.

17 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply
18 facilities, and communitiy facilities, \$2,478,000.

19 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

21 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
22 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
23 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
24 \$1,204,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
2 facilities, \$745,000.

3 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
6 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
7 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,558,000.

8 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
9 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

10 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$2,035,000.

12 SPECIAL FACILITIES

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 \$229,000.

15 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

23 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
24 ties, \$430,000.

25 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training

1 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$4,742,000.

3 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
4 \$350,000.

5 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

6 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
7 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
8 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
9 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisi-
10 tion, \$11,500,000.

11 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

12 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
13 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

14 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

15 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
16 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

17 FAR EAST AIR FORCES

18 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational
19 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
20 ties, \$2,642,000.

21 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
22 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$12,738,000.

1 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
4 utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

5 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

6 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities,
7 \$820,000.

8 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
9 training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground
10 improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$59,613,000.

15 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
20 improvements, \$39,217,000.

21 SPECIAL FACILITIES

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 \$170,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$70,000,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof

1 “\$12,686,000”; and strike out “\$1,463,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$2,756,000”.

3 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
4 MAND”—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
5 stead, New York, strike out “\$729,000” and insert in place
6 thereof “\$929,000”; and strike out “\$686,000” and insert
7 in place thereof “\$886,000”.

8 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
9 COMMAND”—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
10 Muroc, California, strike out “\$27,478,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$29,442,000”; and strike out “\$16,192,000”
12 and insert in place thereof “\$18,156,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
15 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
16 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
17 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

18 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

21 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

22 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
23 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

25 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-

1 kota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof
2 "\$9,220,000";

3 (3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
4 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000 and in-
5 sert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

6 (4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike
7 out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,-
8 000";

9 (5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-
10 nard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in
11 place thereof "\$2,935,000";

12 (6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,
13 Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and
14 insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

15 (7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-
16 port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and in-
17 sert in place thereof "\$893,000";

18 (8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,
19 Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place
20 thereof "\$2,676,000".

21 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

22 (1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,
23 Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

25 (2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,

1 New York, strike out “\$15,803,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$16,654,000”;

3 (3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,
4 Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and
5 insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;

6 (4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force
7 Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.

9 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

10 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
11 Houston, Texas, strike out “\$3,438,000” and insert
12 in place thereof “\$3,876,000”;

13 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
14 San Angelo, Texas, strike out “\$4,081,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$5,088,000”;

16 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
17 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out “\$500,000 and insert
18 in place thereof “\$545,000”;

19 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
20 Harlingen, Texas, strike out “\$446,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$529,000”;

22 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
23 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out “\$883,000” and insert
24 in place thereof “\$1,129,000”;

25 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,

1 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and
2 insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

3 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
4 bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in
5 place thereof "\$1,304,000";

6 (8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base,
7 Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert
8 in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

9 Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—
10 with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, Dis-
11 trict of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place
12 thereof "\$825,000".

13 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
14 COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force
15 Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada,
16 strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,-
17 500".

18 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

19 (1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort
20 Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in
21 place thereof "\$7,363,000".

22 (2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor,
23 Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place
24 thereof "\$12,218,000";

25 (3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fair-

1 field, California, strike out “\$9,769,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$11,473,000”;

3 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
4 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
5 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

6 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

7 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
8 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
9 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

10 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
11 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$611,000”;

13 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
14 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
15 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

16 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
17 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

19 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
20 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

22 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
23 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
24 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

25 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—

1 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
2 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

3 Under the subheading “AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL
4 AIDS”—with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,-
5 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

6 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
8 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
9 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$824,-
10 300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”, re-
11 spectively.

12 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
13 is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED
14 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

15 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

16 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
17 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert in
18 place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

19 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
20 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
21 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

22 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
23 gow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert in
24 place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

25 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,

1 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
2 and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

3 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
4 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-
5 sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;

6 (6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
7 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;

9 (7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
10 port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;

12 (8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
13 North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in
14 place thereof “\$27,035,000”;

15 (9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
16 port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”
17 and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;

18 (10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
19 Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-
20 sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;

21 (11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
22 Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert
23 in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;

24 (12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-

1 consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place
2 thereof “\$8,726,000”;

3 (13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base,
4 Oscoda, Michigan, strike out “\$3,278,000” and insert in
5 place thereof “\$3,808,000”;

6 (14) with respect to various locations, strike out
7 “\$21,510,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,201,000”.

8 Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

9 (1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,
10 New York, strike out “\$17,966,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$22,005,000”;

12 (2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station,
13 Searsport, Maine, strike out “\$473,000” and insert in
14 place thereof “\$745,000”;

15 (3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station,
16 Tacoma, Washington, strike out “\$129,000” and insert
17 in place thereof “\$251,000”;

18 (4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Okla-
19 homa City, Oklahoma, strike out “\$5,990,000” and in-
20 sert in place thereof “\$7,763,000”.

21 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

22 (1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base,
23 Amarillo, Texas, strike out “\$17,121,000” and insert
24 in place thereof “\$26,471,000”;

1 (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,
2 Alabama, strike out “\$18,000” and insert in place
3 thereof “\$22,000”;

4 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
5 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out “\$24,433,000” and
6 insert in place thereof “\$33,858,000”;

7 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
8 Nevada, strike out “\$2,221,000” and insert in place
9 thereof “\$3,063,000”;

10 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
11 Oklahoma, strike out “\$977,000” and insert in place
12 thereof “\$1,064,000”.

13 Under the subheading “AIR UNIVERSITY”—with respect
14 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
15 out “\$215,000” and insert in place thereof “\$311,000”.

16 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
17 MAND”—

18 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
19 ville, California, strike out “\$13,395,000” and insert
20 in place thereof “\$15,993,000”;

21 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
22 etta, Georgia, strike out “\$345,000” and insert in place
23 thereof, “\$500,000”.

24 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
25 COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out “\$6,939,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,530,000”;

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out “\$5,488,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,220,000”.

Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out “\$922,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,190,000”;

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out “\$2,179,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,643,000”;

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out “\$14,518,000” and insert in place thereof “\$15,322,000”;

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out “\$943,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,075,000”;

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out “\$1,694,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,966,000”;

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

1 (7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,
2 Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$1,236,000" and
3 insert in place thereof "\$1,586,000";

4 (8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
5 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$2,064,000"
6 and insert in place thereof "\$2,607,000";

7 (9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
8 Nebraska, strike out "\$5,697,000" and insert in place
9 thereof "\$6,155,000";

10 (10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,
11 Plattsburgh, New York, strike out "\$1,491,000" and
12 insert in place thereof "\$2,027,000";

13 (11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
14 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$661,000"
15 and insert in place thereof "\$720,000";

16 (12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,
17 Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$2,791,000" and
18 insert in place thereof "\$3,181,000".

19 Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—
20 with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-
21 ginia, strike out "\$2,613,000" and insert in place thereof
22 "\$2,785,000".

23 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
24 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED
25 STATES" as follows:

1 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—
2 with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
5 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
6 amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,-
7 934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000",
8 "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

9 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
10 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
11 read as follows:

12 "(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
13 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
14 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
15 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
16 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
17 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
18 in the next military construction authorization Act would
19 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
20 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
21 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
22 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
23 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
24 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
25 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the

1 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon
2 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
3 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
4 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.”

5 TITLE IV

6 GENERAL PROVISIONS

7 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
8 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
9 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
10 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
11 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.
12 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
13 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
14 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.
15 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
16 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
17 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.
18 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
19 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
20 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
21 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

22 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such
23 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
24 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
25 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$120,099,000; outside the United States, \$34,613,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$297,714,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$260,377,000; outside the United States, \$65,627,000; section 202, \$65,091,000; or a total of \$391,095,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$437,357,000; outside the United States, \$225,407,000; section 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$727,764,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller

1 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
2 quately auditing those contracts;
3 the President may exempt those contracts from the require-
4 ments of that section.

5 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
6 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
7 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
8 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
9 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
10 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
11 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall
12 report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the
13 Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to
14 all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to
15 the lowest responsible bidder.

16 SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
17 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary
18 of a military department in connection with the establish-
19 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
20 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
21 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and
22 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
23 tion are repealed, except—

24 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-

1 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
2 titles that contain the general provisions;

3 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
4 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
5 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
6 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

7 (3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for
8 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
9 contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-
10 second Congress;

11 (4) the authorizations for public works and the
12 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
13 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
14 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886) ;

15 (5) the authorization for the development of the
16 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
17 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
18 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

19 (6) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
20 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
21 the authorization for (a) development of classified fa-
22 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in
23 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
24 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified

1 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
2 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
3 (66 Stat. 606, 609) ; and

4 (7) the authorization for public works and for the
5 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
6 of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47) , as amended.

7 SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69
8 Stat. 324, 352) , as amended, is further amended to read
9 as follows:

10 "SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
11 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
12 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
13 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
14 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
15 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
16 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
17 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
18 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
19 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
20 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
21 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
22 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
23 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

24 SEC. 408. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
25 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-

ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

1 SEC. 410. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
2 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
3 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

4 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
5 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
6 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
7 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
8 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
9 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
10 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
11 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
12 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
13 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
14 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
15 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
16 acquisition.”

17 SEC. 411. Prior to the termination of, or reduction in
18 the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity
19 being conducted on the date of enactment of this Act within
20 any of the forty-eight States or the District of Columbia
21 (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such
22 termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the
23 supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished by
24 other than civilian employees of the United States, and
25 where such activity has been conducted for five or more

1 years and requires the services of ten or more civilian em-
2 ployees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the Presi-
3 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
4 sentatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed
5 termination or reduction. Such proposed termination or
6 reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of sixty
7 days of continuous session of the Congress following the
8 filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during
9 such sixty days either House of the Congress has adopted
10 a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed
11 termination or reduction described in such report. For the
12 purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be con-
13 sidered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the
14 computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded
15 the days on which either House is not in session because of
16 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

17 SEC. 412. The authority granted by section 2304 (a)
18 (1), title 10, United States Code, shall not be exercised
19 during the national emergency declared by the President on
20 December 16, 1950, except with respect to—

21 (1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of
22 which does not involve more than \$2,500;

23 (2) purchases or contracts for nonperishable sub-
24 sistence supplies;

25 (3) purchases or contracts for property or services

1 for experimental, developmental, or research work, or
2 making or furnishing property for experiment, test,
3 development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000.

4 (4) when in furtherance of small business, labor
5 surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency
6 head determines that supplies or services are to be pro-
7 cured from small business concerns, from concerns which
8 will perform the contracts substantially within labor
9 surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor,
10 or from concerns which will perform the contracts sub-
11 stantially within areas of major disaster.

12 SEC. 413. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
13 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the
14 Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August
15 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing
16 shall be available for the construction of family housing at
17 any installations for which family housing is authorized to
18 be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

19 SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
20 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out
21 in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and insert-
22 ing in place thereof the figure "\$147,341,000".

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

Calendar No. 866

85TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{
REPORT
No. 842

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

AUGUST 8 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 8240]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide new authorization for construction by the military departments, both in the United States and at certain overseas locations, in a total amount of \$1,205,643,000.

The new authorization granted for each military department is as follows:

Title I (Army):

Inside continental United States.....	\$114, 949, 000
Outside continental United States.....	34, 477, 000
Classified (sec. 102).....	143, 002, 000
Total.....	292, 428, 000

Title II (Navy):

Inside continental United States.....	\$216, 175, 000
Outside continental United States.....	47, 695, 000
Classified (sec. 202).....	59, 056, 000
Total.....	322, 926, 000

Title III (Air Force):

Inside continental United States.....	380, 354, 000
Outside continental United States.....	160, 705, 000
Classified (sec. 302).....	47, 000, 000
Total.....	588, 059, 000
Grand total.....	1, 203, 413, 000

FORM OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The bill on which the committee has held its hearings is S. 1940. The companion bill as passed by the House is H. R. 8240. Subsequent to passage by the House of H. R. 8240, the President proposed supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense materially reducing the amount originally contemplated to be funded for the fiscal year 1958 military construction program. These changes, together with those recommended by the committee, have made it desirable to report a clean bill instead of adding the required number of amendments to the House-passed bill.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

Full and complete hearings, either open or classified as the military subject required, were held. Over 4,000 line items were considered. A published record of open hearings on nonclassified subjects is available.

Major attention was directed to policy areas incident to the overall military requirements, and not specifically to routine, repetitive items. It stands to reason that if Congress and the Nation are to raise and maintain modern military forces capable of conducting successful operations, these forces must be provided with minimum essential bases and facilities.

CRITERIA

In order to insure a review procedure which would meet both the interests of economy and military need, a standard criteria was established in light of which all service requests were compared. In general outline, this criteria is as follows:

1. Items considered firm requirements:

(a) All operational aspects properly justified and for which the services plan to request fiscal year 1958 appropriations.

(b) Replacement of irreparable facilities considered essential to morale and well-being.

(c) Chapels.

(d) Community and recreational facilities and housing at isolated installations, or where local civilian community support does not exist at an adequate level.

(e) Key service school installations for which the services have a long peacetime need.

(f) Deficiency authorizations pertaining to prior-authorized projects resultant from cost-of-living increases, from changes in military technology, and new operational concepts.

2. Items considered feasible to delete or defer:

(a) Officers clubs, noncommissioned officers clubs, commissaries, post exchanges, theaters, etc., where adequate facilities already exist, substitute facilities are available, or local civilian community can provide similar support.

(b) Replacement of existing administration buildings, warehouses, and headquarters buildings.

(c) Barracks and bachelor officers quarters where 50 percent of permanent construction program is already provided, or under construction, or where existing World War II assets can continue to be utilized on an economical basis.

(d) Family housing where there exists adequate civilian community support or sufficient prior authorization.

(e) All items not being funded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTIONS

In developing the program, each service reviewed the field requests at their respective Washington headquarters. The resultant projects were then submitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations. Originally, the total service requests for new authorization amounted to \$3,641 million. At the Secretary of Defense level, this total was reduced to \$2,098 million. Following this, further reductions were made, presumably by the Bureau of the Budget, until the final official figure submitted to Congress was approximately \$1,779 million.

On the opening day of the hearings, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations stated:

Finally, after our Department of Defense review of this bill was completed, the Bureau of the Budget conducted a still further review based on the most rigid concept of economy, such as deferring the replacement of many World War II structures and rephrasing certain new work until future years, as a result of which the program was reduced to the amounts shown in titles I, II, and III of the bill now before this committee, which total \$1,561,338,000 (\$323,325,000 in title I; \$435,099,000 in title II; and \$802,914,000 in title III). This final reduction conforms to a corresponding reduction of \$200 million in the fiscal year 1958 new obligational authority which was made by the President on April 18, 1957. *We feel that this is the minimum amount needed to satisfactorily support the missions assigned to our military forces.*¹

In order that the committee may review the status of all military construction authorization through fiscal years 1948 to date, the following summary is provided:

¹ Italics supplied.

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Total authorizations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1957.....	\$4,065	\$3,333	\$10,832	\$18,230
Less authorization rescinded by sec. 204, Public Law 534, 82d Cong.....	0	-17	0	-17
Less authorization rescinded by title VI, Public Law 209, 83d Cong.....	-271	-78	-399	-748
Less authorization rescinded by sec. 302 (b), Public Law 534, 83d Cong.....	0	0	-37	-37
Less authorization repealed by sec. 511, Public Law 161, 84th Cong.....	-297	-190	-484	-971
Less estimated authorization to be repealed by sec. 410, Public Law 968, 84th Cong.....	-61	-45	-200	-306
Less total appropriations, fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1957.....	-3,048	-2,745	-8,239	-14,032
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1957.....	388	258	1,523	2,169
Additional new authorization proposed by fiscal year 1958 bill.....	+298	+391	+727	+1,416
Increases in prior years authorizations proposed by fiscal year 1958 bill.....	+28	+43	+115	+181
Total of fiscal year 1957 residual and proposed fiscal year 1958 authorizations.....	714	692	2,365	3,771
Less estimated authorization to be repealed by sec. 406 of fiscal year 1958 bill.....	-8	-10	-50	-68
Less estimated authorization available for rescission as reported under provisions of sec. 408 (b), Public Law 564, 81st Cong.....	-10	0	0	-10
Less proposed fiscal year 1958 appropriation.....	-362	-297	-1,153	-1,900
Residual authorization to be available at end of fiscal year 1958.....	334	341	1,162	1,793

NOTE.—The above figures are no longer correct. They were correct at the time Mr. Bryant, Assistant Secretary of Defense (P. and I.) made his statement.

This tabulation illustrates that the amount of residual authorization available to the three military departments is being steadily reduced each fiscal year. This means that each year the lowest priority projects are eliminated through the annual rescission of unfunded authorization over 5 years old. Consequently, the balance of residual authorization left available is steadily being reviewed, and consists of both urgently needed projects, and other projects for which the requirement has changed due to revisions in missions and weapons. The military departments are each using part of their annual construction appropriations to assure continued progress on the most urgent of these residual projects. The balance of their annual appropriation is applied to essential new authorizations. It is necessary that a proper balance and control be maintained between these two segments of the program, so that construction can satisfactorily proceed on both residual and new authorization, at a rate which is in proper relationship to the funds the Defense Department can make available for military construction. In order to achieve this, the amount of new authorization requested this year has been closely limited and consists mainly of additional increments on projects already underway, items required to support new weapons developments, and essential modernization of our bases. *It is intended to fund and utilize all of this new authorization during fiscal year 1958.*¹

¹ Italics supplied.

AUTHORIZATIONS VERSUS APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee compliments the Department of Defense on its intent to "fund and utilize all this new authority during fiscal year 1958." It has long been of the opinion that too great an imbalance between authorizations and appropriations is undesirable. This year, for the first time in the long history of military construction authorization bills, it appeared that the Department of Defense would fund its new authorizations.

On June 28, 1957, the President, upon the advice of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (dated June 26, 1957), submitted to Congress a request for a supplemental Defense appropriation in the amount of \$1,665,500,000. This action, in effect, precluded the services from funding a large portion of the fiscal year 1958 construction authorization program as planned and testified to, in spite of the fact that the Department of Defense had assured the committee that "it is intended to fund and utilize all of this new construction during fiscal year 1958."

The composition of the Defense funding program as of August 6, 1957, is shown below:

[In millions]

Service	Amount of new fiscal year 1958 authorization for which appropriation committee clearance is requested	Amount of prior years authorization for which appropriation committee clearance is requested	Total fiscal year 1958 appropriation funding program	Total fiscal year 1958 appropriation request	Difference between appropriation funding program and appropriation request
Army-----	\$297	\$77	\$374	\$325	\$49
Navy-----	312	74	386	335	51
Air Force-----	594	582	1,176	1,000	176
Total-----	1,203	733	1,936	1,660	276

FINAL COMMITTEE ACTION

Based on the foregoing and in consideration of all facts presented during the hearings, the committee felt that it had no other recourse than to deny authorization authority for those items which the services were forced to defer because the Director of the Bureau of the Budget would not allow sufficient moneys. The committee requested and received from the Army, Navy, and Air Force a list of the items which they proposed to defer. In almost all instances, the services assured the committee that these deferrals did not represent cancellations and that it was still their plan to eventually construct the suspended facilities whenever the Bureau of the Budget approved the necessary funds.

As a result of its completed review of all items in the bill, the committee concluded that it would recommend new authorization in a total amount of \$1,203,413,000. This amounts to a reduction of \$357,925,000 or 23 percent of the sum originally requested, decreasing each services' portion as follows: Title I, Army, \$30,897,000 (10 percent); title II, Navy, \$112,173,000 (26 percent); title III, Air Force \$214,855,000 (27 percent).

AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Since the advent of modern, highly complex, and technical military forces, it has become absolutely essential to maintain a long-range and integrated construction program designed to provide a base structure sufficient to support assigned missions.

Congress has the responsibility to provide the needed authority and funds. It has consistently done so through the fiscal year construction authorization bills and appropriations. Congress is entitled to the benefit of unfettered advice from those who have the responsibility for directing our common defenses.

In this case, a program supposedly approved by the Defense Establishment, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President was officially presented in May 1957, as the minimum amount needed to satisfactorily support our military forces, and yet, only a month later, insufficient funds to implement the program were requested.

The committee is gravely concerned over the possibility that fundamental military decisions are being made by agencies and individuals of the Federal Government who have no military responsibility or background. Unless planning and coordination are shockingly deficient, it is inconceivable that the decision to reduce the supplemental appropriation request was not known at the time that senior Defense officials presented the original construction program to Congress. It is understandable that, in the light of economy, coupled with the possible easing of international tensions, the military programs could and should be modified. The committee feels that it is entitled to receipt of information of this nature and certainly expects the Defense witnesses who appear before it be current with regard to policy decisions.

The committee is completely cognizant of the fact that the military construction program is a most difficult one to develop and administer. It is also aware that any overproduction of facilities would not only be wasteful, but perhaps detrimental to our economy as well. It assumes, however, that the active Military Establishment is designed to support approved national policy and that this Military Establishment needs the minimum base facilities to carry out its mission. With this in mind, the previously mentioned review criteria was developed by the committee in an effort to insure maximum economy without attenuating operational capabilities. The committee hopes a similar reason exists to support the reduction in the funding program; that the reduction does not mean that essential defense doctrine has been subordinated to financial considerations.

FUTURE PROGRAMS

It might be argued that the committee should approve all authorization requests regardless of the funding plan, but authorizations without funding do not produce tangible and usable military facilities. The committee definitely believes Congress and its committees should not be called upon to review and act on programs which are not intended to be implemented during the period for which the need is said to exist.

Next year the committee hopes it will receive at an early date in the session a completely finalized program predicated on military needs and supported by all witnesses responsible for all aspects of the program's formulation.

Nothing in this report should be interpreted to mean that the committee lacks faith in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and OSD officials who most ably presented the fiscal year 1958 program. On the contrary, the committee has learned during past years to expect an outstanding level of professional competence from these witnesses, both civilian and military. This year was no exception. In the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (P&I), the Directorate of Construction is to be especially complimented. The development by this group of a unified format in presenting project justifications has greatly simplified and expedited the work of the committee. During the past 3 years, the committee has observed that the impartial and comprehensive review principles developed and applied by this Office has resulted in concrete progress toward unification, with a resulting confidence so instilled that the committee has often been able to accept on face value the voluminous data presented in support of individual line items.

Although the committee is gratified with these advances, it is constrained nevertheless to cite several aspects of the program toward which it feels most serious concern. The committee is not satisfied that certain construction requirements, such as title VIII housing financed under other legislation, are subject to the same rigorous scrutiny as is applied to the military construction authorization bill. The committee is further disturbed over the possibility that the military construction program is being developed over a lengthy programming cycle on a unilateral basis without any definite knowledge of the military attitude or national policy conditions which may prevail at the time of eventual construction.

It becomes only too obvious, therefore, that the most grave responsibility rests on the Office of the Secretary of Defense to overcome these deficiencies in its final evaluation of the military construction authorization requests before their submission to Congress. The committee feels that this responsibility can only be discharged by concurrent and final reconciliation of the military construction program with approved military plans, force levels, and objectives.

FAMILY HOUSING

STATUS OF PROGRAM

During the hearings Defense witnesses testified that the family housing program was predicated on the authorized military strengths of 1,027,000, Army; 857,000, Navy and Marine Corps; and 925,000, Air Force, or a total of approximately 2,809,000. Based on this strength, the requirements, assets, and deficits were stated to be as follows:

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Gross requirements.....	245, 498	173, 797	274, 600	693, 895
Adequate existing housing.....	150, 029	97, 130	153, 485	400, 694
Current deficit.....	95, 469	76, 617	121, 115	293, 201
Programmed housing.....	22, 424	22, 636	49, 817	94, 927
Deficit.....	73, 045	53, 931	71, 298	198, 274
United States.....	57, 147	47, 645	36, 653	141, 445
Overseas.....	15, 898	6, 286	34, 645	56, 829

From the above, it can readily be seen that even if the currently programed 94,927 units are constructed, there will still exist a deficit of almost 200,000 units. This does not take into consideration the requirements of enlisted personnel of the lower pay grades.

APPROPRIATED FUND HOUSING

While it is the announced decision of the Department of Defense to make maximum utilization of the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act (Capehart), requests for certain appropriated fund units were made. A summary of this type of proposed authorizations follows:

Military department and installation	Units	Amount	Military department and installation	Units	Amount
All Departments.....	2,381	\$54,572,000	Navy.....	459	\$15,645,000
United States.....	1,607	28,038,000	United States.....	0	0
Overseas.....	774	26,534,000	Overseas.....	459	15,645,000
Army.....	415	12,625,000	Air Force.....	1,507	26,302,000
United States.....	100	1,736,000	United States.....	1,507	26,302,000
Overseas.....	315	10,889,000	Overseas.....	0	0

This bill authorizes a total of 2,146 units out of the original request of 2,381—a reduction of 235. One hundred sixty-seven units of this reduction were in effect withdrawn at the request of the military departments. The remaining 68 units were those planned for Wendover Air Force Base, Utah. The committee deleted these latter units based on testimony taken and upon advice from the Air Force that it was not going to fund the Wendover operational items initially contemplated.

TITLE VIII (CAPEHART) UNITS

The title VIII housing program is not a part of the military construction bill under consideration. However, in view of the extreme importance of this program in relation to the overall Department of Defense housing needs, the following tabulation is furnished showing the status of the 93,796 units (231 projects) of new title VIII housing which had been approved by the Department of Defense as of April 15, 1957:

	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Approved by ASD (P & I).....	93,796	27,832	21,314	44,650
In process.....	64,915	12,757	20,719	31,439
Being advertised.....	4,547	2,147	0	2,400
Bidder accepted.....	8,068	4,078	160	3,830
Under contract.....	16,266	8,850	435	6,981
Private.....	4,558	1,899	0	2,659
FNMA.....	11,708	6,951	435	4,322
Total cost of units:				
Under contract.....	\$245,080,949	\$134,730,972	\$7,183,807	\$103,166,170
Average.....	15,067	15,224	16,515	14,778
Mortgage proceeds.....	235,826,690	129,074,170	6,847,200	99,905,320
Average.....	14,498	14,585	15,741	14,311
Private.....	63,071,115	26,793,515	0	36,277,600
FNMA.....	172,755,575	102,280,655	6,847,200	63,627,720
Appropriated funds.....	9,254,259	5,656,802	336,607	3,260,850
Average.....	569	639	774	467

WHERRY HOUSING

While Wherry units, like Capehart, are not specifically a consideration of this bill, nevertheless they represent an important portion of the military departments family-housing assets.

The Wherry Act was originally conceived as a method of providing housing units by private financing. About 82,000 units were constructed during the effective life of the act (August 8, 1949 to June 30, 1956).

Based on a certification by the Secretary of Defense that the housing was needed, the FHA insured the mortgages. These unit mortgages averaged \$8,100, or 90 percent, of the average unit cost limitation of \$9,000. The mortgages are designed to amortize over a period of about 33 years at 4½ percent interest.

In general, Wherry housing projects were built on land leased to a private sponsor by the Government for a 75-year period, at the end of which the Government obtains title.

Rental levels are established by the FHA predicated on estimates of the ability of military personnel to pay. Military personnel occupying such units do not surrender their rental allowances as is normally the case, nor is it mandatory that they occupy these units as is the case with those constructed with appropriated funds.

The present value of the 82,000 Wherry units located on Government-leased land is estimated in excess of \$1 billion.

Recognizing that Wherry units would be in existence at military installations for perhaps the next 60 to 70 years and that in many instances it would be desirable for the military departments to purchase them, Congress enacted permissive acquisition legislation in 1955. In 1956, by Public Law 1020, 84th Congress, it was made mandatory for the Defense Establishment to purchase Wherry projects at locations where Capehart units were to be constructed. To date, 14 Wherry projects representing 7,937 units have been acquired, or are in the process of acquisition.

COMPARATIVE COSTS

The following tabulation shows the comparative costs of the several methods of providing housing for military personnel:

Cost of family housing (without land)¹

Type of housing	20 to 25 years	50 years
Appropriated fund ²	\$22,842	-----
Initial cost.....	16,500	-----
Interest, at 3¼ percent.....	6,342	-----
Title VIII, Capehart ³	26,543	-----
Initial cost.....	15,500	-----
Interest, at 4 percent.....	9,042	-----
Mortgage insurance premium.....	565	-----
Appropriated-fund aid.....	1,000	-----
Interest, at 3¼ percent on appropriated-fund aid.....	436	-----
Title VIII, Wherry (if acquired) ⁴	20,000	-----
Mortgage payments (assumed from sponsor).....	13,443	-----
Equity payment to sponsor.....	1,500	-----
Immediate minor repairs.....	500	-----
Alterations to quarters standards.....	3,500	-----
Interest on Government costs.....	1,057	-----
Title VIII, Wherry (if not acquired), quarters allowance, at \$90 per month..	27,000	\$54,000
National average ⁵	20,549	-----
Initial sales price.....	12,136	-----
Interest, at 5½ percent.....	8,423	-----
Cost of land.....	(2,664)	-----

¹ Estimated costs based on average units and on the assumption that \$90 per month (average quarters allowance) is available to pay all costs, including interest and mortgage insurance premiums in the case of FHA-insured mortgages (Capehart and Wherry). Costs of maintenance and operation are not included since they are assumed to be the same, on the average, for all types of units.

² Initial cost is an average based on contracts recently awarded. Interest rate of 3¼ percent is based on approximate cost of money to the Government; at this rate a monthly payment of \$89.93 will pay off \$16,500 in 21 years 3 months; the total amount paid during this period would be \$22,842 (\$16,500 for principal and \$6,342 for interest).

³ Initial cost of \$15,500 plus \$1,000 of appropriated funds for site acquisition, site preparation, and off-site utilities (authorized by sec. 505, Public Law 155-82) provides a unit comparable to that obtained under MCA program. A monthly payment of \$81.84 plus the mortgage insurance premium (ranging from \$3.12 in the 1st year to 0 in the last) pays off the \$15,500 insured mortgage loan in 25 years; the total amount paid would be \$25,117 (\$15,500 for principal, \$9,052 for interest, and \$565 for mortgage insurance). Using a monthly payment of \$5.04, the \$1,000 of appropriated funds can be paid off in 23 years 9 months; the total amount paid would be \$1,436 (\$1,000 for principal and \$436 for interest).

⁴ Based on unit costing \$9,000 with \$8,100 mortgage financed at 4½ percent (under authority of sec. 10, Public Law 94-83). Assuming that unit is bought after 4 years of private operation, 333 payments (27 years 9 months) remain on the mortgage loan; at \$38.82 per month, these amount to about \$7,500 for principal and \$5,427 for interest plus \$516 for mortgage insurance. Appropriated funds must be used for equity payment to the sponsor and for minor repairs and major alterations (to bring house up to public quarters standards). Using a monthly payment of \$49.30 (balance of average quarters allowance), the total appropriated-fund cost of \$5,500 at an interest rate of 3¼ percent can be paid off in 11 years 1 month; the total cost is \$6,557, including \$1,057 for interest.

⁵ Based on committee estimate of 1957 average sales price per single unit. Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates national average sales price for 1954 as \$12,300; 1955 as \$13,600; 1956 as \$14,700. All prices included land costs, which are estimated to average 18-20 percent of sales price. Interest figured on mortgage of \$10,000 at 5 percent for 25 years.

Source: Family Housing Division, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations.

SUMMATION AND COMMITTEE OPINION

Understandably, the above costs are averages (in some instances only estimates) and cannot be considered accurate in every precise detail. Nevertheless, it is plain that appropriated fund housing is the most economical, even considering estimated interest costs. Actually, in years of a balanced budget, anticipated interest costs should not materialize.

The approximate \$3,700 difference between title VIII Capehart units and appropriated-fund units, when applied to the near 200,000-unit deficit, would result in a saving of \$740 million if direct appropriations were used. If the interest on appropriated funds is deducted, the savings would be over \$1,900 million—either is worth realizing. Viewed another way, if appropriated units had been substituted for the nearly 94,000 Capehart units approved by Defense as of April this year, the savings would have been almost \$340,000,000.

If Wherry units are not acquired, each \$9,000 unit will eventually cost the taxpayer in excess of \$50,000 (through rental allowances). Multiplied by 80,000 units, the total is \$4 billion. If 80,000 units are acquired at an average outside cost of \$20,000 each, the total charge would be \$1,600 million, including substantial alterations designed to better the units.

The committee has stated before and iterates again that the most economical way to provide family housing for our service families is through the use of appropriated funds. Each service representative, when appearing before the committee, has agreed to this principle. On May 23, 1957, Secretary Wilson, when appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee in defense of the fiscal year 1958 appropriations request, was asked for his opinion, as a businessman, whether it would be less expensive for the Government to construct appropriated-fund housing. Secretary Wilson's reply is quoted below:

I think the answer to that is "Yes," that it is cheapest to do it with Government funds, unless you do it in such a way that it is more or less off your military post or something like that in a separate housing business.

But if we have to be responsible for the rent for 20 years or something like that, or repurchase it like we have to do with warehouses, I would say it really would be cheaper to put the money up in the first place, because, basically, our Government has the best credit in the United States; it can borrow money cheaper.

This was an effort, I suppose, to avoid taxing the people now with a big budget and trying to get the budget down.

The committee is in complete accord with the policy to provide service personnel with adequate quarters. It is interesting to note from the preceding cost table that the average initial cost of current military housing is nearly 7.5 percent above the national single-unit average. The committee has consistently approved properly justified appropriated-fund family housing requests and expects to continue to do so until the need is met. However, it is vigorously opposed to "credit card" budgetary procedures which camouflage the initial costs by deleting them from current budgets only to pass them on accompanied by unnecessary "service charges" for inevitable payment by the taxpayer. As Secretary Wilson stated in the last paragraph of the above quotation, it can be argued that the non-appropriated-fund method "get(s) the budget down." Such philosophy is quite erroneous. Hidden costs not shown in the budget do not really balance the budget. They simply confuse the issue, delay the reckoning, and present a false picture.

The committee also believes, as it stated last year, that the permanent housing construction program must be designed to bear a definite

relation to the long-range troop basis. If mortgages are to be amortized over a long period of time, it is only logical to expect that the continuity of the troop structure bear some relation to the amortization period of the mortgage. When this year's housing program was presented to the committee, it was stated that it was designed to support the existing troop strength of approximately 2,800,000, yet, since that time, orders have been issued to reduce this strength by 100,000 and rumors persist that additional and larger cuts are in the offing.

In consideration of the foregoing, section 407 has been included in the bill to insure the proper and essential review by the committees of Congress responsible for military legislation.

SUBSTANDARD QUARTERS

Another facet of military family housing which is currently a source of much concern is the fact that 1 out of 5 public quarters is substandard. The Comptroller General has ruled that any structures, now in use as housing, which were built, remodeled, or converted with funds appropriated to the military departments, must be considered and operated as public quarters regardless of adequacy, unless the legislative authority for construction specifically contemplated the development of rental housing.

Under this ruling, many serious morale problems have been created, for situations inevitably arise in which one man must forfeit his full quarters allowance for a substandard dwelling while at the same installation another man of equal or lower grade is provided completely adequate quarters.

This condition is known to be a deterrent to reenlistment. When it is realized that there are more than 36,000 such housing units now in use by the military service, it can readily be understood that the problem is one of serious proportion.

It will be remembered that last year the Honorable Charles E. Bennett, United States Representative, Second District, of Florida, introduced H. R. 5731, designed to solve the problem of substandard quarters. The Bennett bill was passed by the House and an amended version was subsequently approved by the Senate. Unfortunately, it did not become law.

This year, Congressman Bennett again introduced his bill (H. R. 1056) which the House passed with certain amendments. Inasmuch as H. R. 1056 was being considered by the committee at the time the military construction authorization bill was presented, the committee took testimony on its provisions during a special session in conjunction with the family housing aspects of the construction bill. As a result, section 407 has been added to title IV of this bill. If enacted into law, section 407 will enable members of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to occupy substandard quarters on a rental basis without losing their basic allowances for quarters. In other words, the services would be authorized to declare certain unsuitable housing facilities inadequate and to use them in the same manner as if they had been constructed as rental units. Personnel could then occupy these inadequate quarters on an appropriate rental basis and receive their quarters allowance from which they would pay the necessary rent.

Each service has innumerable examples of inequities as to occupancy of the various types of public quarters, many of which arise in the same area. Of course, the ultimate solution is to provide adequate and sufficient public quarters. Until such can be achieved, the services should, in the opinion of the committee, be permitted to utilize inadequate quarters on a rental basis where—

(1) There is a lack of suitable community support or other housing, or,

(2) There is a requirement that certain key personnel live on the station, regardless of the adequacy of the housing.

The committee is of the firm view, and so advised the departmental representatives, that no recently constructed permanent housing assets should be declared inadequate under the authority of this bill.

Mr. John H. Arrington, Chief, Family Housing Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, assured the committee that "we do not contemplate that this would apply to any recently built appropriated fund housing, but this would in general apply to both Wherry housing and to substandard public quarters." In addition, the committee was assured that the rentals to be charged for substandard housing would be established at levels comparable to those for similar accommodations in the community.

In many areas surrounding military installations, availability of private housing has improved to the point where service personnel are able to obtain reasonable rentals or purchase their own homes. There are, however, numerous areas both within the continental limits of the United States and overseas where this not the case. At some installations there is no private housing. At others, service personnel are not able to afford the high rentals. In recent years, Government rental housing and adequate public quarters have been constructed to alleviate the situation, yet, under existing conditions at many bases, the precipitate elimination of all substandard public quarters would only aggravate the morale problem stemming from the need to house members and their dependents. At a time when all services are making every effort to retain career personnel, this would create a most undesirable situation.

There are instances where, because of the nature of their assigned duties key personnel are required to occupy public quarters at or near their place of duty. In this situation, military requirements give the commanding officer no alternative but to assign members to on-station public quarters without regard to their adequacy. To eliminate all substandard quarters under such circumstances would reduce the military capabilities of the station. It should be noted here that in the case of many overseas installations, no housing is available other than that which exists on the base. Under such circumstances, the services, from a morale standpoint, consider it essential that as many members as practicable have their families with them, in spite of the inadequacy of the quarters.

Both the President and the Secretary of Defense have vigorously supported this type of legislation and have stated that it was high on the list of things needed to be done to improve the morale and better the living conditions of our service personnel. The committee concurs in this point of view but points out that the program cannot be successful unless sound criteria is developed from which proper evaluations can be made. Defense witnesses stated that they under-

stood this aspect of the program and that certain standards are being developed. While not finalized as yet, the tentative draft presented to the committee, as shown below, is an indication of the areas to be covered:

MINIMUM PUBLIC QUARTERS STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF
EXISTING STRUCTURES (AS OF MAY 31, 1957)

I. The following principles will be used for evaluating the adequacy of family housing for assignment to military personnel as public quarters, and as a general guide in rehabilitation programs:

Location.—The location of the dwelling unit should be suitable for the residence of the assignee. Locations considered suitable should not be adjacent or in close proximity to firing ranges, troop areas, sewage-disposal plants, waste dumps, industrial exhausts, swampy, stagnant tracts producing objectionable odors, ammunition storage areas, railroads, industrial shops, slum areas, sources of excessive noise or hazards to residents, and locations for which daily commuting presents extreme inconvenience, difficulties, or inappropriateness to an occupant with respect to his duties.

Net floor area.—The following table of net floor areas, by rank or grade and number of bedrooms will be used as a guide in determining the minimum size of dwelling units suitable for assignment. Net floor area is defined to be the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service and bulk storage space in lieu of basement), attic, garage (or carport), and open porches:

Minimum net square foot floor area per dwelling

Number of bedrooms	Major or lieutenant commander and above	Captain or lieutenant and below	Enlisted grades
1.....		700	610
2.....	950	865	785
3.....	1,120	1,035	985
4.....	1,225	1,185	1,080

Livability.—The total floor area should be appropriately distributed among the various rooms, spaces, and passages. Design should be such that the access to the bathroom from a bedroom does not require passage through the living room or kitchens; access to bedrooms does not require passage through other bedrooms; and access from the main exterior entrance to the living room does not require passage through the kitchen or bedrooms. Units should have adequate closet, storage, and service space; and adequate yard and service areas.

Construction and facilities.—The structure shall be of sound construction and in a good state of repair, with finished exterior and interior wall surfaces; finished floors; kitchen and bathroom facilities for the exclusive use of the occupant; proper ventilation and lighting; essential water, sewer, elec-

tricity, cooking, and heating services. Structures should be weather and watertight, structurally safe, and without serious potential hazards to the occupants. The dwelling should be provided with essential collateral equipment and furnishings.

II. Only in unusual circumstances will Wherry housing be declared inadequate for reasons of size alone.

III. In the event a dwelling unit does not qualify for assignment as public quarters and the survey establishing comparable rent and related charges for such unit in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular A-45 (revised) results in a proposed total charge for the unit in excess of the assignee's basic allowance for quarters, the dwelling unit may be designated inadequate public quarters to be occupied on a voluntary basis with forfeiture of basic allowance for quarters.

STATISTICAL DATA

The following chart shows all of the housing under the jurisdiction of the affected services from which it will be noted that the worldwide total of public quarters is 149,208. Of these, 112,691 are adequate and 36,517 are substandard. The chart, in the last column, shows the number of housing units now rented under the authority of the act of July 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 316).

Housing under the jurisdiction of the services

	Public quarters			Rental housing, total
	Total	Adequate	Substandard	
Army.....	92,434	71,134	21,300	1,827
Navy and Marine Corps.....	20,128	13,766	6,362	31,941
Air Force.....	35,625	27,000	8,625	9,300
Coast Guard.....	686	556	130	50
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	None			None
Public Health Service.....	335	235	100	None
Total.....	149,208	112,691	36,517	43,118

The next chart below shows, by service, the number of substandard units, the gross appropriations now made in housing allowances against the occupancy of these units, and the rent receipts which it is estimated will accrue to the Government by reason of the rental of these units under the provision of H. R. 1056.

	Department of Defense ¹			Total
	Army	Navy and Marine Corps	Air Force	
Number substandard units.....	21,300	6,362	8,625	36,287
Gross appropriations.....	\$24,151,200	\$7,030,010	\$8,480,313	\$39,661,523
Rent receipts.....	15,383,286	3,443,114	5,708,160	24,534,560
Cost to Government.....	8,767,914	3,586,896	2,772,153	15,126,963

¹ With respect to the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service the gross appropriation required will be \$222,702. The rental receipts will approximate \$132,000, or a net cost of \$90,702.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

After reviewing the problem, the committee concluded that the principle involved in this legislation is sound and that it is desirable for morale purposes to provide legislation which will not require full payment of quarters allowances for inadequate or substandard housing. Defense officials testified that 70 to 75 percent of the type housing involved would be utilized by enlisted personnel and officers in the lower ranks. The committee is of the opinion that this legislation should not be designed to exclude bachelor officers quarters. It feels that bachelor officers, like their married contemporaries, should not be required to occupy substandard quarters at the expense of losing their full quarters allowances.

Of main concern is the criteria to be utilized in determining whether a housing unit is substandard. Defense witnesses indicated the Department's intent to establish rigid and uniform regulations and to establish rental rates comparable to those existing in each local community for similar type quarters. The committee believes that rentals should in every respect be competitive and that privately owned housing in a given area not be made to suffer as a result of the establishment of rentals lower than those found on the open market.

The committee believes that no unit should be declared substandard unless:

- (a) It has substantial structural or design defects.
- (b) It lacks essential utilities or facilities.
- (c) It is in a deteriorated condition.
- (d) It constitutes a potential hazard to health and safety.

It has been suggested to the committee that any legislation enacted should be limited to a specific time period and that if units declared substandard were not altered or improved so as to qualify as standard quarters at the end of this time period, they should be demolished or otherwise disposed of. The committee expects the services to bend every effort to improve any such substandard quarters with the goal in mind of eventually eliminating the necessity of assigning personnel to substandard units. However, in an era of economy it is not realistic to assume that the services will be allowed the necessary funds required to reach this goal in the immediate future and that it would certainly be impractical to permit the destruction or removal of usable units, especially if no other housing were available.

The committee will expect the service secretaries to report annually hereafter in conjunction with the submission of each new military construction authorization bill the number of units declared substandard during the preceding year, the criteria utilized, the reasons for such actions, the progress made in eliminating units from the substandard list, and the costs involved.

TROOP HOUSING

In consideration of prior year authorization bills, the committee has endeavored to approve every reasonable request for barracks and supporting facilities on the proper assumption that our enlisted personnel are not only entitled to modern living quarters, but that denial of such facilities results in false economy.

This year the committee established the previously mentioned criteria of not approving barracks or bachelor officers quarters where 50 percent of the permanent construction program was already provided, i. e., either existing or under construction. It takes this action in view of information received that if the planned program envisioned by the 3 services up to and including fiscal year 1960 are implemented, the Army would have 58 percent of its permanent-type barracks constructed, the Navy, 57 percent, and the Air Force, 90 percent. On the surface, it would appear logical to acquiesce to all requests until the desired percentages were reached; however, such a philosophy does not take into consideration the recent cuts in troop strength, or rumored future cuts.

The committee realizes that this year's reduction in barracks for the Army are somewhat unfair to that service because the Army alone, of the 3 services, has designed its permanent construction program to support approximately only 66 percent of its existing troop basis. But because the Army has received the greater percentage of past and current force reductions, the committee feels it has no other recourse than to adhere to the 50 percent criteria until such time as responsible officials inform the committee as to what further reductions can be expected, how such will be distributed, and at what level a future troop structure will be established.

It is interesting to note at this place in the report that the first indication the committee had that the recent 100,000-man cut was to be made was received from the newspapers.

Included in this bill is a \$9 million authorization for troop housing facilities in Korea. While the committee believes that our soldiers in Korea should long ago have been provided with the necessary quarters, it is concerned over the possibility that overseas construction programs of this nature may not be fully coordinated with and designed to meet the requirements of a long-range deployment plan. The committee was assured by the Department of the Army that in this instance the Department would exercise the utmost care to insure that no facilities would be constructed without definite plans to utilize them, and that should any changes in deployment be made, they would inform Congress and request permission to reprogram. The committee strongly urges the Defense Department and the services to explore every possibility of utilizing surplus commodities to pay for all feasible facilities constructed in overseas areas. It will expect the Department of Defense to be prepared to report its progress in this area when next year's construction bill is submitted.

GUARANTEED RENTAL HOUSING

General provision 506, as originally presented, exempted the \$100 million authorization from rental for family housing contained in section 302, of Public Law 534, 82d Congress, from the repeal of certain prior authorizations. The committee considers that the rental guaranty provisions are no longer required and, therefore, has deleted this authority from the exceptions listed in general provision 506. This provision is discussed at greater length in a subsequent portion of this report.

REAL ESTATE

The large acquisitions of real estate by the military departments over the past several years has been a matter of concern to members of the committee. The real property under military control includes property owned, leased, used by permit, easement, and various occupancy rights (foreign base agreements). As of June 30, 1956, the military departments controlled approximately 33.6 million acres of land throughout the world. This land, together with the improvements, had an original cost to the United States of \$22.9 billion.

The real estate under military control may be grouped as follows: 27.1 million acres in the United States, together with improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$18.2 billion; 3.9 million acres in the Territories and possessions, together with the improvements thereon, having an original cost of \$2.5 billion; and 2.6 million acres in foreign countries together with the improvements thereon having an original cost of \$2.2 billion.

The real property under military control in the United States consists of the following:

	Acres
Fee-owned.....	7, 415, 936
Public domain.....	14, 978, 035
Temporary use.....	2, 758, 146
Leased.....	1, 866, 496
Easements.....	62, 836
Total.....	27, 081, 449

Over half of the land under military control is public domain land that has never been on the tax rolls; 7,415,936 acres of land have been removed from the tax rolls in the United States.

The 27.1 million acres in the United States is approximately 1.4 percent of the total land area in the United States.

The Government owns 409.5 million acres of land in the United States, or 21.5 percent of the total land area.

The following summary shows the land acquired and disposed of by each military department during the past 10 fiscal years:

	Acquisitions		Disposals	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost ¹
Army:				
Fee and lesser.....	650, 665	\$39, 256, 171	1, 642, 467	} \$3, 335, 015, 709
Public land.....	2, 335, 417	2, 052, 603	5, 167, 707	
Navy:				
Fee and lesser.....	96, 091	42, 310, 381	95, 479	} 306, 160, 928
Public land.....	259, 600	50, 075, 257	157, 781	
Air Force: ³				
Fee and lesser.....	407, 613	80, 681, 835	540, 494	} ⁴ 138, 971, 735
Public land.....	1, 171, 944	407, 018	877, 218	
Subtotal fee and lesser.....	1, 154, 369	162, 248, 387	2, 278, 440	-----
Subtotal public land.....	3, 766, 961	52, 534, 878	6, 202, 706	-----
Total for 3 military departments.....	4, 921, 330	214, 783, 265	8, 481, 146	3, 780, 172, 585

¹ The cost shown for the disposal of property includes the original cost to the Government of the land, together with the improvements made available for disposal in accordance with existing law.

² Includes cost of improvements that were situated on 2,266,938 acres of leased land.

³ Period 1949-56. Army figures include actions taken in behalf of "Air Corps" prior to 1949.

⁴ Includes cost of improvements that were situated on 185,898 acres of leased land.

This shows that large areas of land have been disposed of. The committee was assured that the Department of Defense is increasing its efforts to dispose of the maximum practical amount.

At the same time, the committee is aware that new concepts and weapons systems have made it necessary to acquire additional acreage. For example, 50,000 acres would have provided an adequate artillery range 15 years ago; however, the present range requirements for rockets, guided missiles, and similar weapons are now measured in millions of acres. Similarly, the old 5,000-foot runways for propeller-type aircraft have now been extended to 12,000 feet in order to accommodate new jet aircraft. From the foregoing, it is obvious that the military departments will continue in the future to have some additional requirements for land acquisition.

The original fiscal year 1958 program submitted from the military departments requested \$92 million for land acquisition. This was reduced to \$22.3 million, as a result of the reviews conducted by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. A summary of the real-estate acquisitions which the bill now contains, is shown in the following tabulation (dollar amounts are in thousands):

	Fee acquisition (in acres)	Fee cost	Easement acquisition (in acres)	Easement cost	Total cost
Army.....	942	\$1,650	1,200	\$310	\$1,960
Navy.....	29,444	8,231	4,345	645	8,876
Air Force.....	9,140	5,480	26,336	8,796	14,276
Total.....	39,215	15,187	30,050	9,452	24,639

REPLACEMENT PLAN

The Department of Defense states that one of the deterrents to its efforts to dispose of real property is the lack of assurance that the necessary replacement property will be obtained. To correct this situation, the Department of Defense is considering a plan for authorizing disposition of high-priced real property and use of part of the proceeds of sale for less expensive replacement property. There are many military installations, originally sited in suburban areas, that are now partially or completely surrounded by urban development. The dollar value of these Government holdings has multiplied; but simultaneously, the potential use by the military department concerned has been lessened and necessary expansion almost completely prohibited.

The Department believes that acquisition of substitute property would permit: (1) More advantageous siting on low-cost lands, (2) substantial benefits to both civil and military interests and (3) reasonable assurance of room for expansion in event of mobilization. If and when such authorization is obtained, it will permit concurrent arrangements to be made for acquisition and disposal.

A plan is also being considered which will permit the sale of nonexcess industrial plants in cases where the production of such plants can be assured by inclusion of the necessary conditions in the instrument of conveyance. This will permit sale of many plants that are now producing end items for the defense program. The production in many

of the plants is a small percentage of the total production capacity of such plants. Needless to say, the sale of such plants will make them available for civilian production and return them to the local tax rolls.

JUST COMPENSATION FOR ACQUIRED PROPERTY

During its deliberations, representations were made to the committee that in many cases where the Government acquired property by condemnation or threat of condemnation, the owners' interests were not "made whole." It was suggested that new legislation should be enacted to change current procedures in order that property owners receive just compensation. It was suggested that any changes in existing laws and procedures should support the principle that a person whose property is involuntarily taken should be at least financially as well off after the taking as he was prior to the loss of his property. For example, an individual whose land is taken might be required to move and thus incur expenses over and above the payment received for his land.

Recognizing that such a problem existed, Congress enacted legislation in 1952 (sec. 401 (b), Public Law 534, 82d Cong.) providing, in substance, that an additional sum up to 25 percent of the fair market value of the land involved could be used to reimburse the affected owners and tenants. However, it was represented to the committee that while this provision of law was a step in the right direction it did not sufficiently cover all aspects of the problem and that additional rectifying actions were needed. It was suggested that the Secretaries of the military departments should be authorized to reimburse owners and tenants not only for the property involved but for other expenses such as cost of moving and storage, plus the previously mentioned 25 percent of the fair market value of the property.

The committee realizes that in some instances where property is involuntarily sold to the Government, special problems could be created not normally found in commercial transactions. It feels, however, that this problem is not limited to military acquisition actions, but is applicable to the entire field of all Government agencies when exercising eminent domain. It notes that the House Armed Services Committee in addressing itself to the problem has appointed a special subcommittee to examine the matter in detail. Because of its scope and the many types of property involved, the committee is of the opinion that further special study is required and that any resultant recommended legislation should be directed solely to this subject and not as part of a military construction authorization bill. The committee proposes to pursue the matter further but before doing so, it requests the Department of Defense to thoroughly review every aspect and to submit concrete recommendations.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES AND PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE

It was recommended to the committee that this year's military construction authorization bill should include a provision designed to govern the method by which the Department of Defense would terminate or reduce the operations of any of its commercial or industrial type activities. It is the committee's opinion that commercial or industrial type activities should not be singled out in this particular

bill when the potentially greater problem exists pertaining to the possible closing or reduction of proper military installations. If such legislation were deemed to be essential, it should be applicable to all military installations and should, in the opinion of the committee, be the subject of a separate bill.

It was further suggested that the committee should include a provision limiting the procurement activities of the Department of Defense for the specific purpose of providing, wherever possible, that procurement would be based on a competitive bid procedure. Without delving into the pros and cons of this suggestion, the committee points out that in the field of military construction, over 93 percent of all contracts entered into during the last 2 years were completed on a competitive-bid basis. Section 505 of the bill covers this aspect.

With respect to the foregoing, it is the committee's firm opinion that any provision contained in the military construction authorization bill should be limited to matters considered germane to the construction field.

CONTINENTAL AIR DEFENSE

During the course of this and last years' hearings on the military construction authorization bills, it has become increasingly apparent to the committee that more and more of our military resources are being directed to the field of continental air defense. Last year, the committee said:

While it is not the committee's intent to delve into the broad fields of military strategy or policy, the very act of authorizing military construction and base structure facilities is in itself a policymaking function, particularly when it deals with the foundations for weapons systems and the bases from which operations will be conducted. As mentioned before, DEW line is a billion dollar project and so is SAGE. The Nike-Talos systems is a multibillion dollar program. These things are basically for defensive purposes. In reviewing the requirements contained in this bill for facilities and systems to provide passive defense, the committee has had occasion to question whether there might be a dangerous trend toward a "Maginot line" type of thinking, and with the construction and establishment of fixed defense installations, whether the military posture of the Nation might as a result be limited in offensive capabilities.

The committee is still of the same frame of mind. It believes the time has come to reevaluate and to insure that our efforts are spent only on those systems that will meet future requirements. The committee believes that close and continuous scrutiny must be given the subject in order that too great a priority is not given to defensive aspects, even to the extent of denying funds and authorizations and of cutting back existing programs in favor of those which promise greater results. Obviously, until we have an offensive weapon system which will completely deter an aggressor, we must maintain adequate defenses. An adequate defense system, however, must be designed to keep pace in a flexible manner with any threat against the United States. In view of the ever-increasing capacity of offensive weapons, both in our hands and in those of the potential aggressor,

the committee cannot help but feel uncomfortable at the thought of spending increased amounts for the weapons which represent but a last-ditch symbol. Defensive operations, in the opinion of the committee, should not be hampered by an absence of initiative which the committee believes is inherent in fixed positions. One has only to remember what happened to the "Maginot line" concept to be well aware of this point.

Approximately 40 percent of this year's Army-construction program is devoted to Nike. Nike is a fixed-point defensive system. It will be remembered that when the Korean war broke out, it was decided to deploy antiaircraft units in defense of key installations in the United States. At first, conventional gun battalions were used. Then as the Nike was developed, the gun battalions were more and more replaced by Nike battalions. The committee believes the original Nike system was properly conceived to meet a need existing at that time, that it fills a requirement as of now; however, the committee questions the wisdom of future extensions of the system on a larger scale. In view of the fact that weapons of mass destruction can be released at great distances from their potential targets, the committee came to the conclusion that the time is at hand when emphasis must be placed on weapons systems which will provide greater defense in depth.

The committee also became quite concerned over the possibility that the Department of the Army might be placing too much emphasis and devoting too much of its effort to static-defense concepts. It feels that the Army must place first priority on the capability to engage in successful and sustained ground combat—that this mission must not be subordinated to any other.

In view of the foregoing, the committee seriously considered recommending that no further authorization be approved to expand the existing Nike system. It does not so recommend only because the best military advice available strongly recommended that the committee approve the program. The committee thoroughly reviewed the subject. It was made the topic of a special classified briefing conducted by a representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and senior departmental witnesses. Results of this briefing were such as to convince the committee that even though it still has doubts, it has no other recourse than to recommend the Nike funds be authorized in this year's construction program.

Even though the committee was impressed by the aforementioned briefing, it could not help but conclude that in many areas each military service is developing weapons systems in a seeming effort to become self-sufficient apparently with little regard to those in existence or being developed by other services. The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to take vigorous action to insure that only those systems are approved and maintained that fit in with the overall strategic doctrine (and at this point, it cannot help but state that it hopes this doctrine will be tailored to tactical and strategic requirements rather than budgetary decisions). The committee feels that it is pertinent at this time to quote from Henry A. Kissinger's article in the Foreign Affairs magazine of April, 1957, entitled "Strategy and Organization":

In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, our actions will of necessity prove haphazard; conflicting proposals

will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. *Each problem, as it arises, will seem novel* and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Our services will find it impossible to make a meaningful choice among the mass of new weapons with which their research and development programs will soon overwhelm them. *We will continue to cede the initiative to others and our course will become increasingly defensive.*

The requirements for each new weapon or system when presented to the committee have been justified mainly on the ground of technological advances and military capabilities. This is only natural and proper but it is also only logical to expect certain older and superseded systems to be discarded. Earlier this year, the Chief of Naval Operations in an appearance before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, stated in part, "we are converting cruisers to missile ships—and we are building guided missile destroyers—because guns are no longer effective against modern aircraft. We are converting to a guided missile capability as fast as we can." The committee cannot help but question the retention and maintenance of conventional antiaircraft artillery units in the troop structure. At this very moment the committee is in receipt of requests to approve leasing arrangements in order that conventional AAA gun battalions may continue to be deployed in defense of key installations. It surely would appear that if further troop reductions are to be made, they should be made in this area.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense must not only closely scrutinize the extent to which our limited military resources are allocated to air defense, including area and point missile systems and manned interceptors, but must also take positive steps to eliminate ineffective weapon systems.

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, JOHN TOWERS FIELD, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Last year, the Navy requested an authorization of \$4 million to establish an airfield near Davidsonville, Md., for the main purpose of indoctrinating midshipmen in naval aviation. At that time the authorization was not granted in light of the heavy concentration of defense air facilities in the Washington area.

While this year's bill as approved by the Department of Defense and presented to Congress contained no similar request, the subject came up in consideration of the future use of the naval facility at Anacostia and the requirement for efficiency flight training and Reserve activities. Navy witnesses pointed out that Anacostia is not suited for jet aircraft and that unless an alternate facility is obtained, the Navy's training requirements in the Washington area could not be adjusted to meet the requirements of modern aircraft. This fact, coupled with the need to provide modern facilities for the training of midshipmen who are now utilizing obsolete equipment (which is no longer produced) makes sound argument for the Navy's requirement.

Navy representatives indicated that they had no exact location in mind, but that the Department would appreciate being authorized sufficient funds to enable it to proceed with planning and land acquisition when a site was finally selected. The committee is sympathetic with the Navy's problem and believes that a solution must

be found. However, after due deliberation, the committee could not see its way clear to approve an authorization, especially since no specific site has been selected and the Bureau of the Budget has not indicated approval of the project. Furthermore, the committee also believes that the establishment of any new military aviation facility in the Washington area must also be analyzed in the light of commercial requirements. Rather than establish a new base, the committee sees no reason why the Secretary of Defense cannot make arrangements for the Navy to utilize a portion of Andrews Air Force Base which is located conveniently between Annapolis and Washington, D. C. It calls on the Secretary of Defense in the interests of unification to direct the Navy and the Air Force to develop a plan for the joint utilization of Andrews Air Force Base that will result in providing the Navy with this much-needed facility.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

In the bill as presented, the Air Force requested \$21,341,000, in addition to the \$126 million previously authorized, for the further development of the Air Force Academy. If authorized, this would bring the total to more than \$145 million. The items comprising this request include the initial increments of the airfield complex, cadet training facilities in the maneuver area, the second increment of airmen's support facilities (dormitories, service club, and branch bank), the cadet chapel, and a hospital.

While taking testimony on the subject, the committee expressed concern over the possibility that the Academy could not commence operations with the \$126 million originally approved. The committee was assured that the present plan is to open the Academy in the summer of 1958 and that it will function and operate as an academy at that time.

The committee is of the opinion that the originally authorized \$126 million should, and would, have provided adequate funds for the entire facility had the installation been properly planned and programmed from the start. It realizes, of course, that there have been certain increases in construction costs during the years subsequent to the initial authorization, nevertheless the committee feels that it would have been possible to have applied certain austere standards even to a project of this nature. The committee is reluctant to recommend any new authorization at this time, however, it wants to insure that the Academy will open on schedule.

The committee has reduced the original request of \$21,341,000 to \$9,425,000. General provision 508 has, therefore, been added to the bill amending section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act (Public Law 325, 83d Cong.) in order to provide authorization to construct the hospital, the chapel, the second increment to the airmen's dormitories, the service club, the nurses quarters, the planetarium and the essential utilities. The portion of the requested \$21 million authorization not included in this bill represents that pertaining to the initial increments of the airfield complex. The committee believes that adequate facilities of this nature exist in the vicinity of the Academy site and that the proposed airfield complex can be deferred, at least for the present time.

NEW FACILITIES

Actually there are no new bases as such contained in this bill for the continental United States. There are certain new facilities, as shown below, and certain new activities to support classified programs included in the bill.

Department	Name of new base	Location	Purpose
Army-----	Cold Regions Laboratory----	Hanover, N. H.----	Research and development.
Air Force-----	Molette auxiliary field ¹ -----	Orrville, Ala.-----	Auxiliary field for Craig Air Force Base.
Do-----	Auxiliary field ¹ -----	Meadow, Tex.-----	Auxiliary field for Reese Air Force Base.

¹ The 2 Air Force auxiliary fields in this tabulation are for flight training purposes only. Strictly speaking, they are not "bases" as they are not occupied by personnel. A runway and a taxiway are the only construction which they require.

THE BILL BY TITLE

There follows a description of the bill by title. The dollar figures and percentages shown reflect the committee's conclusions and recommendations.

TITLE I—ARMY

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title I (Army):

Inside continental United States-----	\$114,949,000
Outside continental United States-----	34,477,000
Classified-----	143,002,000
Total-----	292,428,000

The Army would be authorized \$292,428,000 in this bill.

A general résumé of major components included in the new authorization total follows:

(a) The sum of \$41.1 million, or 14.0 percent of the total request for construction of troop and family housing. (In this connection no new dollar authority is contained herein for the 415 sets of family quarters. The committee notes that sufficient unused prior authorization for family housing is available, and accordingly has added sec. 401 to title IV of the bill to permit reprogramming of prior authorization to meet these requirements.)

(b) The sum of \$115.0 million, or 39.1 percent of the total request for construction of facilities for the tactical defense of key cities, bases, and industrial centers in the continental United States. Also \$8.5 million, or 3.1 percent of the total for construction of facilities in close support of tactical installations defending the continental United States.

(c) The sum of \$20.8 million, or 7.1 percent for construction in support of Army aviation at 17 permanent Army installations.

(d) The sum of \$10.8 million or 3.7 percent of the total request for facilities necessary for the furtherance of the Army's research and development program.

(e) The sum of \$20.8 million, or 7.0 percent of the total for continuance of construction of the France line of communications. Also the sum of \$9 million, or 3.0 percent of the total for further improvements to troop living conditions in Korea.

(f) The balance of the program, 67.0 million or 22.8 percent, for other essential construction of facilities including \$28.0 million for other classified facilities, both in continental United States and temporary base rights areas overseas, necessary to the accomplishment of the Army's missions, worldwide.

A description of the program by major activities and the missions follows:

Technical services

Ordnance Corps.—The assigned mission of the Ordnance Corps is to support Army combat forces by the provision of all weapons, ammunition, combat vehicles, ordnance general supplies and trained personnel. This total \$21,970,000, represents 7.5 percent of the total program.

Quartermaster Corps.—The Quartermaster General develops, provides and services food, clothing, petroleum (except field and higher echelon maintenance of pipelines), aerial supply equipment, other quartermaster equipment, supplies, maintenance and services for the Army, and, as assigned, for the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; provides for the disposal of Army surplus personal property; and provides for the care and disposition of the remains and personal effects of deceased personnel of the Army and as directed or agreed upon, of the Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and for general supervision of the operation of national cemeteries. Included in the program for the Quartermaster Corps is \$6,721,000, representing 2.3 percent of the program.

Chemical Corps.—The mission of the Army Chemical Corps is to provide support to the Department of Defense (Army, Air Force, and Navy including the Marine Corps) in the fields of chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare, including smoke, flame, and incendiaries, and materiel and equipment. This segment totals \$681,000, representing 0.2 percent of the program.

Signal Corps.—The primary mission of the Signal Corps is to provide communication and pictorial services for the United States Army Establishment, worldwide, and for other components of the Department of Defense as directed. The Signal Corps element totals \$1,936,000, representing 0.6 percent of the program.

Corps of Engineers.—The Corps of Engineers is the construction agency for the Department of the Army. Construction proposed for the Corps of Engineers totals \$4,915,000, representing 1.7 percent of the program.

Transportation Corps.—The Transportation Corps provides or secures transportation services for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This element totals \$2,037,000, representing 0.7 percent of the total program.

Medical Corps.—The Army Medical Service furnishes the Army Establishment, and when appropriate, members of other uniformed services, medical and dental care, hospitalization, evacuation, preventive medicine, veterinary, and other services essential to the maintenance of health. This will provide \$2,857,000 for construction, representing 1 percent of the total program.

Continental United States Armies

First United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York,

Rhode Island, and Vermont. The program includes \$6,719,000, representing 2.3 percent.

Second United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. The program contains \$5,767,000, representing 2.0 percent.

Third United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The program includes \$18,991,000, representing 6.5 percent.

Fourth United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. There is included in the program \$17,800,000 in support of Fourth Army, representing 6.3 percent of the total program.

Fifth United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The Fifth Army element of the program totals \$8,573,000, representing 2.9 percent.

Sixth United States Army.—A continental United States Army Command, the area of which is comprised of the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

The program provides \$4,794,000 and utilities, representing 1.6 percent.

Other continental United States areas

The United States Military Academy, West Point, has the mission of instructing and training the Corps of Cadets, so that each graduate shall have the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continuing development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Regular Army. The Army's program contains \$1,666,000 for construction of utilities at the Academy, representing 0.6 percent.

Armed Forces special weapons project.—The Armed Forces special weapons project is an agency of the Secretary of Defense and of the three military departments. Its mission is to furnish support to the departments in the field of atomic weapons by providing technical, logistical, and training services. The AFSWP responsibilities include all national stockpile sites: Sandia Base at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; a field command at Sandia Base and the project headquarters. Construction in the amount of \$1,056,000 is included in the program, or 0.4 percent.

Tactical installation support.—These facilities provide the close logistical support for tactical defense installations in the continental United States. This element of the program totals \$8,466,000 at various installations, or 2.8 percent.

Overseas permanent and general areas

Alaskan area.—The Alaska Command provides the ground and antiaircraft defense and logistic support of military bases in Alaska and operates the Army Arctic Test Center. The program includes \$4,143,000, or 1.4 percent.

Pacific Command area.—The program includes \$154,000 for construction of medical facilities at one installation.

Caribbean Command area.—The mission of the command is to provide ground and air defense of the Panama Canal; to operate the United States Army Caribbean School for Latin American and United States military personnel, and to provide logistical support for military bases in the Panama-Puerto Rico area. The program for this command totals \$426,000 or 0.03 percent.

United States Army, Europe.—This element of the program totals \$20,754,000 for continuance of construction of the line of communications, France. The mission of the LOC is to provide logistical support for the combat forces of the United States Army stationed in Germany. The construction is for various installations, and represents 7.1 percent of the total program.

Army Forces, Far East.—The program includes \$9 million or 3 percent of the program for further improvements to troop living and operating conditions in Korea. The mission of the United States Army in Korea is to command all United States Army Forces assigned or attached in Korea and to exercise operational control over United Nations, Republic of Korea, and such other ground forces as may be provided by the commander in chief, United Nations Command. To provide logistical support for such United Nations or Republic of Korea forces or agencies as may be directed and to be prepared to militarily support United States interests in preservation of the independence of the Republic of Korea as such action may be directed by the commander in chief, Far East Command.

Section 102

This section includes \$143,002,000 or 48.6 percent of the program for the establishment and development of classified Army installations, worldwide.

Section 103

This is a new provision, not heretofore requested by the Army. The authority will permit the Department of the Army to purchase out of appropriations available for military construction, family housing, including land acquisition, at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents. The provision limits the number of units that may be acquired by the Army to 300 sets of quarters, and stipulates that housing so acquired shall be subject to existing statutory cost and space limitations. The committee acknowledges that this authorization is permissive in nature, and accordingly no dollar authorization has been granted. The committee also understands that the Army will not resort to condemnation proceedings in the acquisition of such housing, except where necessary to clear the title.

Sections 104, 105, 106, and 107

These sections provide amendments to Public Laws 209 and 534 of the 83d Congress, and Public Laws 161 and 968 of the 84th Congress, increasing authorizations granted in these laws at certain installations. These amendments are necessary to defray deficiencies in authorization granted in fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1957, brought about basically by the general rise in construction cost indexes throughout the world. They total 23,489,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Title II (Navy):

Inside the United States.....	\$216, 175, 000
Outside the United States.....	47, 695, 000
Classified.....	59, 056, 000
Total.....	\$322, 926, 000

The Navy would be authorized in this bill \$322,926,000 for new public works and an increase in prior authorization of \$42,648,000 to compensate for increases in cost to construct certain public works which had been authorized in previous years. The Navy's program is an integral part of a long-range plan to modernize its Shore Establishment in keeping with the modernization of its operating forces which has been underway since World War II.

The Navy's program approved by the committee consists of the following 10 classes of facilities:

1. *Shipyard facilities, \$42,597,000 (13 percent)*

Shipyard facilities line items are required to support the improved types of ships which are now joining the fleet, to protect the existing installations, to provide certain classified operational facilities, to provide urgently needed barracks, hospitals, and community facilities and to improve the capabilities in research and development.

One of the major items is the first increment of construction of a drydock at the Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash., to accommodate the *Forrestal* class carriers for major repairs. When it is completed, this will be the only United States drydock in which battle damage to these large carriers can be efficiently and economically repaired. Other projects in this group will correct deficiencies in facilities at continental installations; will provide for the minimum construction, the building of a dike, to protect the naval shipyard at Long Beach, Calif., from flooding by the ocean as a result of ground subsidence; will provide for another increment in the development of naval base and naval station at Subic Bay in the Philippines; and will provide certain facilities to the commanders in chief of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets essential to their operations.

2. *Fleet base facilities, \$6,126,000 (1.9 percent)*

It is the purpose of the fleet facilities program to insure adequate shore-based support, peculiar to no single element of the operating forces, but general in scope and completely responsive to broad requirements of composite elements of the fleet. Such facilities must be so located as to insure support on a timely and efficient basis in order to maximize the combat effectiveness of limited combat forces.

3. *Aviation facilities, \$161,361,000 (49.8 percent)*

The aviation shore activities are necessary for training new naval aviators, for supporting the operating forces of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, and for research and development in the aeronautical field. The projects in the bill under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Aeronautics are designed to enable the Naval Aeronautical Shore Establishment to more nearly attain its mission and to improve the safety of operations as illustrated by the extension of runways, installations of optical landing systems, and TACAN installations.

Aviation facilities comprise nearly half of the Navy's program, dollarwise. There are several package programs in this group. The first of these is to provide an optical landing system at 18 continental and 5 overseas air stations to reduce pilot error in landing fast jet aircraft. The second program will provide a TACAN—tactical air navigation facility—at continental and overseas stations. This is another safety system, an electronic directional facility which will provide for improved navigation of aircraft. The third package will provide guided-missile support facilities at continental and overseas air stations. The final aviation package program will provide for extension of 1 runway at each of 11 continental and 3 overseas air stations to a length equivalent to 10,000 feet at sea level. It includes a corresponding increase in taxiway length and runway and taxiway lighting. The Navy requires the longer runways for safe landing of fast jet aircraft and safe recovery after abortive takeoffs of loaded aircraft. At 8 of the 14 stations acquisition of land will be required for the runway extensions and end zones and relocation of public or private utilities, railroads, roads, or drainage ditches.

The aviation facilities are composed of five groups of air stations. The program will provide for the second increment in the development of two new air advanced training stations at Meridian, Miss., and New Iberia, La. It also provides for dredging and construction of a pier at Pensacola to accommodate an *Essex* class, angled-deck carrier to be used in carrier qualification training procedures. Deficiencies in facilities will be corrected at the other stations.

The second group are the fleet support air stations, made up of 60 line items at 19 stations. Included are second increments for development of a master jet field at Lemoore, Calif., a seaplane facility at Harvey Point, N. C., and an auxiliary field used in training in guided-missile operation at San Clemente Island, about 80 miles west of San Diego, off the coast of California. The other projects are for relatively minor buildup of existing stations in line with technological advancements.

The third group pertains to Marine Corps air stations. It includes another increment for development of the Beaufort, S. C., station for accommodation of the 3d Marine Air Group. It will also provide for modernization of the other four stations, including land for developing the Mojave Station under the new concept to minimize future encroachments.

The fourth group of special-purpose air stations includes items for continued buildup of these existing stations.

The final aviation facilities group pertains to existing overseas stations. The major project in this group will provide the second increment of facilities for the development of the naval air station, Roosevelt Roads, P. R. Although the runways have been in use for the annual fleet exercises, the other station facilities, including some transferred from the Army, of World War II vintage, have been inactive for a number of years. This station is being used for guided-missile training of the operating forces of the Navy in the Atlantic Fleet. The other projects will continue the development of the Navy's strategic overseas bases. The second and final project in this year's program for family housing is included for the naval station at Argentia, Newfoundland.

4. *Supply facilities, \$3,628,000 (1.1 percent)*

The mission and purpose of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts shore facilities is to provide direct supply support to the fleet throughout the world. Supply centers and depots replenish combatant ships and mobile support ships wherever deployed, as well as furnishing supply support to naval installations, such as shipyards, air stations, training centers, etc. Navy material stocks, repair parts, and consumable supplies are controlled by inventory control points which are also a part of the Bureau's shore facilities.

This group of projects will provide for electronic data processing facilities at three continental supply offices; the second and final increment of petroleum storage replacement facilities at Adak; a commissary store at Guam; and the second increment for development of the supply depot at Subic Bay, Philippine Islands.

5. *Marine Corps facilities, \$14,516,000 (4.6 percent)*

The Marine Corps is subject to call on short notice to deploy its forces, ranging in size from a few men to a division, to any part of the world, for guard duty, to quell a disturbance, or to participate in full-scale war. Consequently the Marines must be highly trained in amphibious and other means of warfare, and competently led. Constant training is necessary to attain and retain proficiency.

6. *Ordnance facilities, \$878,000 (0.03 percent)*

The objective of the military construction program of the Bureau of Ordnance is to provide and keep modern facilities ashore for effective support of the fleet. Recent introduction of new weapons into the fleet has generated requirements for new support facilities. In turn, these new support facilities are already placing greater demand on our stations for electric power, steam, and water. Additionally, these are urgent requirements to replace or modernize overage facilities.

At five of the activities important development work on guided missiles will be conducted. At the other ordnance activities facilities will be provided for storage and processing of guided missiles and other types of ammunition.

7. *Service school facilities, \$8,813,000 (2.7 percent)*

The Chief of Naval Personnel's program is part of an integrated continuing plan designed to provide a balance between the new weapons system and the demand for high degree of personnel training and stability in view of limited manpower resources. The program includes facilities to meet new training requirements, and for the improvement of morale and stability of personnel through the provision of better living accommodations and adequate recreational facilities.

The projects are for personnel training facilities and barracks and bachelor officers' quarters. The first increment for extension of Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy, long recommended by the Board of Visitors, is included. It will provide for the construction of the foundations and the plans for later construction of the superstructures of the additional wings to Bancroft Hall. The 3,600 midshipmen at the Academy are now crowded into space designed to accommodate only 2,500. The project, when completed, will relieve this intolerable condition.

8. *Communication facilities, \$21,223,000 (6.5 percent)*

The mission of naval communications is to—

(a) Provide required reliable, secure, rapid communications primarily for control of the operating forces, and secondarily to facilitate the administration of the Naval Establishment.

(b) Perform classified operations required of the Navy by the National Security Agency and the Chief of Naval Operations.

The items in this group are needed primarily to modernize the Navy's communication system in keeping with the tremendous technical advances in communication equipment which offer increased speed and reliability with an attendant reduction in manpower. One continental and one overseas project will permit the Navy to fulfill, in part, its responsibility to provide a link in the Department of Defense communication "scatter system." This system is nearly 100 percent reliable, a very important asset in the northern areas where it will operate and where long and frequent "blackouts" are not uncommon with conventional equipment.

9. *Yards and docks facilities, \$4,728,000 (1.5 percent)*

The Bureau of Yards and Docks shore activities are required for several purposes: (a) To receive, store, and ship construction materials and advanced base components for current and mobilization overseas construction; (b) for the operations and maintenance of facilities at major naval complexes; and (c) supervision of construction of the overall Navy and, as required, Air Force public-works program.

10. *Increases to prior authorizations*

The committee also approved a number of amendments to prior authorizations of public works. It considered that the various factors contributing to higher costs in today's construction market warrant the requested increases in authorization. The amount approved totals \$42,648,000.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATION

Title III (Air Force):

Inside continental United States.....	\$380,354,000
Outside continental United States.....	160,705,000
Classified.....	47,000,000
Total.....	588,059,000

The Air Force would be authorized \$588,059,000 in this bill to provide for the construction of new facilities at 187 major installations, of which 123 are inside the United States and 64 are in overseas areas. The bill also provides facilities at a number of other installations and sites including operational sites for strategic defense and tactical missiles, off-base navigation aids, aircraft control and warning system sites, and facilities at classified locations. In addition, the bill provides an increase of \$114,962,000 in authorization in prior years' laws to cover the increased costs on certain approved projects.

A breakdown of the Air Force authorization requests is contained in the following tables:

	Authorization amount	Percent of total
<i>Thousands</i>		
Inside the United States:		
Air Defense Command.....	\$94,556	16.1
Air Materiel Command.....	26,666	4.5
Air Proving Ground Command.....	5,826	1.0
Air Research and Develop Command.....	22,689	3.9
Air Training Command.....	43,002	7.3
Air University.....	50	.008
Continental Air Command.....	1,428	.2
Military Air Transport Command.....	4,997	.8
Strategic Air Command.....	152,542	26.1
Tactical Air Command.....	21,038	3.6
Special facilities.....	229	.04
Aircraft control and warning system.....	7,331	1.2
Inside United States, total.....	380,354	64.7
Outside the United States:		
Alaskan Air Command.....	17,872	3.0
Air Materiel Command.....	247	.04
Far East Air Forces.....	9,797	1.7
Military Air Transport Command.....	14,741	2.5
Strategic Air Command.....	61,821	10.5
U. S. Air Forces in Europe.....	36,057	6.1
Special facilities.....	170	.03
Aircraft control and warning system.....	20,000	3.4
Outside United States, total.....	160,705	27.3
Sec. 302 Classified facilities.....	47,000	7.9
Worldwide total.....	588,059	100.0

Air Defense Command

The mission of this command is to provide for the air defense of the continental United States.

This program amounts to \$94,556,000.

Included within the total are \$13,793,000 to provide facilities in support of Strategic Air Command heavy and medium bomber squadrons; \$244,000 to provide support facilities for a strategic missile squadron; \$42,963,000 to provide facilities for 4 air defense missile squadrons; \$5,215,000 for the acquisition of necessary real estate to provide Air Defense Command ammunition storage facilities in support of various fighter-interceptor squadrons.

The remainder of the Air Defense Command program provides facilities required to support the basic mission.

Air Materiel Command

The mission of this command is to (1) provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance, and supply for the United States Air Force; (2) provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies for the United States Air Force; (3) train specialized units for the accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and (4) train individuals requiring a long training lead time to fill requirements of air depot type units scheduled for activation and to fill replacement requirements. This program amounts to \$26,666,000.

Air Proving Ground Command

The mission of this command is to (1) perform employment suitability testing of aircraft, guided missiles, navigational aids, components, and material; (2) develop techniques and procedures in the use and operation of aircraft, guided missiles, armament, and components applicable to Air Force purposes. This program amounts to

\$5,826,000, consisting of an electronic test range, radar communications test range, guided-missile electronic test range, armament research test range, quarters for officers and nurses, base chapel, storm drainage disposal, and necessary acquisition of land to support off-base instrumentation sites.

Air Research and Development Command

The mission of this command is to attain and maintain qualitative superiority by the following procedures: (1) Conduct or supervise scientific and technical studies required for the accomplishment of Air Force missions; (2) seek new basic knowledge from which improved aeronautical equipment, material, weapons, and techniques can be developed; (3) undertake the development and recommend the adoption of appropriate new and improved devices and systems for the conduct and support of air warfare, including aircraft, missiles, weapons, techniques, and procedures applicable to Air Force purposes. This program amounts to \$22,689,000.

Air Training Command

The mission of this command is to provide flying training leading to an aeronautical rating; aircrew training; basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty; basic military training; mobile training, and such other training as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, USAF. This program amounts to \$43,002,000.

Air University

The mission of this command is to prepare officers for command of large Air Force units, wings, groups, and squadrons, and for staff duties appropriate to those command positions, and to provide education to meet the scientific requirements of the Air Force. This program, amounting to \$50,000, provides for acquisition of a runway clearance easement at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

Continental Air Command

The mission of this command is to discharge within the continental United States and field responsibilities of the Chief of Staff, USAF, with respect to:

The Reserve Forces for the Department of the Air Force that are assigned to the Continental Air Command, including supervision and inspection of the Air National Guard of the United States.

Domestic emergencies.

Miscellaneous administrative functions.

In the event of war or other emergency, mobilize the units and/or individuals of the Air Force Reserve that are assigned to the Continental Air Command.

Discharge within the continental United States such other responsibilities as the Chief of Staff, USAF, may direct.

The program amounts to \$1,428,000.

There are no facilities included in this program in support of the Reserve Forces mission. Reserve Forces facilities are being provided under the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended.

Military Air Transport Service

The mission of this command is to provide (1) airlift required in support of approved joint war plans; (2) scheduled airlift for the Department of Defense within the continental United States; between

the continental United States and overseas areas, and between and within overseas areas as directed by higher authority; (3) worldwide air transport, air weather, airways and air communications and air rescue service systems; (4) flight service within the Zone of Interior; (5) organization and training of air resupply and communications services; (6) supervision and control and maintenance of primary facilities required for performing its assigned mission; (7) theater jurisdiction in overseas areas where MATS units are stationed but which are outside the jurisdiction of any theater commander. This program amounts to \$4,997,000.

Strategic Air Command

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program amounts to \$152,542,000.

Included in the Strategic Air Command program are funds to provide facilities required at 4 new dispersal bases and additional facilities necessary at 5 dispersal bases included in prior programs; and additional facilities at 10 heavy bomber home bases. These additional home-base requirements are necessitated primarily by conversion from B-36 to B-52 aircraft.

Eight million ninety-six thousand dollars will provide required facilities for air defense missions at 10 Strategic Air Command bases; \$13,417,000 accommodates redeployment of air defense interceptor-fighter missions at 3 bases. The remainder of the Strategic Air Command program, will provide for items required to support the basic mission throughout the entire command.

Tactical air command

The mission of this command is to provide for Air Force support of land, naval, and/or amphibious forces and operational training of Air Force units therefor. This program contains \$21,038,000.

Special facilities

This section provides \$229,000 for classified facilities.

Aircraft control and warning system

The aircraft control and warning system is the ground environment portion of the air defense system. The function of this system is to detect and identify all airborne objects, evaluate the threat, commit and control weapons such as manned interceptors and missiles for the destruction of enemy targets.

The aircraft control and warning portion of the program totals \$7,331,000 which provides operations building additions, receivers and transmitters, troop housing and messing facilities, additional water supply, utilities, multipurpose recreational facilities, and acquisition of necessary real estate at various aircraft control and warning installations.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The mission of the Alaskan Air Command is to organize and conduct the air defense of Alaska and provide early warning to the United States and Canada. This command supports the Strategic Air Command, Military Air Transport Services, COMALSEAFRON, the United States Army, and the northwest route to the Orient. This program amounts to \$17,872,000.

Included within the Alaskan Air Command total program there are facilities to support modification of 10 existing radar towers totaling \$3,350,000; facilities for a classified operational site for \$8 million; and operational, technical, and maintenance facilities costing \$2,924,000 required to support F-102 type aircraft. The remainder of the program is composed of items to satisfy the basic Alaskan Air Command mission.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND (OVERSEAS)

The mission of the Air Materiel Command is to provide adequate and efficient systems of procurement, production, maintenance, and supply for the United States Air Force; provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies of the United States Air Force; train specialized units for the accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters; and train individuals to fill requirements of newly activated air depot units and replacement requests. This program amounts to \$247,000.

Far East Air Forces

The mission of this command is to conduct tactical operations, the air defense of Japan, Ryukyus, Marianas, Hawaii, and the United States installations in the Philippines; to provide air transportation for combat troops, other personnel and supplies in the Pacific and Far East areas, and to provide logistic support to FEAF and SAC forces. This program amounts to \$9,797,000.

Military Air Transport Service (overseas)

The mission of this command is to provide aircraft required in support of approved joint war plans; scheduled airlifts for the Department of Defense between the continental United States and overseas areas; between and within overseas areas; worldwide air transport; air weather; airways and air communications, air-rescue service systems, and organization and training of Air Resupply and Communications Service and all elements thereof. This program totals \$14,741,000.

Strategic Air Command (overseas)

The mission of this command is to organize, train, equip, administer, and prepare a force capable of conducting strategic operations in accordance with directives and policies issued by Headquarters, United States Air Force. This program amounts to \$61,821,000 for the Strategic Air Command and provides facilities at Andersen Air Force Base on Guam, Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, and 14 various locations in foreign countries.

Included within Strategic Air Command program are facilities to support a classified operation totaling \$29 million, and operational-type facilities at 2 locations required for support of fighter-interceptor aircraft totaling \$1,131,000. The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic SAC mission requirements.

United States Air Forces in Europe

The mission of this command is to support the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; United States Commander in Chief, Europe, and the other component commanders under USCINCEUR in their assigned missions; to fulfill responsibilities assigned the Joint Chiefs of Staff in areas not included in either the NATO or the

USCINCEUR's areas of responsibility, and to support commanders operating directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program amounts to \$36,057,000 for United States Air Forces in Europe and provides facilities at 39 locations.

Included in the program are facilities to support 3 bases in Spain totaling \$9,214,000; aircraft control and warning activities at 2 locations totaling \$451,000; mobile radio squadrons at 4 locations totaling \$735,000; 3 locations for ammunition storage, assembly and checkout totaling \$1,059,000; fighter-interceptor aircraft at 1 location totaling \$796,000; a global communications center totaling \$43,000; 3 sites for Mideast operational and logistic support totaling \$6,637,000; facilities at 2 bases totaling \$5,053,000 in support of fighter-bomber operations; medical facilities at 2 locations totaling \$1,513,000 and special weapons training at 1 location costing \$47,000.

The remainder of the program is composed of items to support the basic USAFE mission requirement.

Special facilities (overseas)

This section covers special facilities at various locations totaling \$170,000 for classified projects at 2 locations.

Aircraft control and warning system (overseas)

This section provides \$20 million for an eastward extension to the distant early warning line.

Ratio of construction in overseas areas.—Prior to fiscal year 1957, the ratio of Air Force construction in the continental United States to construction overseas averaged approximately 60 percent for bases inside United States and 40 percent for overseas locations. In fiscal year 1957 the ratio for continental United States rose to 70 percent, and the overseas portion dropped to 30 percent. The Air Force military construction program for fiscal year 1958 continues the trend started in fiscal year 1957 of minimizing foreign construction.

The "Outside the United States" section of title III of the bill contains an authorization total of \$160,705,000. However, the bulk of this total is scheduled for the North American Continent, its approaches, and the United States Territories and possessions. Therefore, the Air Force program for foreign establishments is only roughly 10 percent of the total program. This is primarily to improve the living conditions of Air Force personnel and to provide facilities for the operation of new weapons at those foreign locations where operational requirements demand continued utilization by United States forces.

TITLE IV—FAMILY HOUSING

Because of the magnitude of the family housing program, it became desirable to group the sections of the bill pertaining to subjects common to all services under one title. Title IV, therefore, contains seven sections dealing with this important segment of the construction program. These are described below in the order of their appearance.

Section 401

This section authorizes the Secretaries of the military departments to exercise any outstanding authority for family housing under previous military construction authorization acts (Public Law 765, 83d Cong.; Public Law 161, 84th Cong.; and Public Law 968, 84th Cong.) to provide family housing at those installations for which family housing is authorized by H. R. 8240. In other words, to the

extent that there remains any of the dollar authorization for family housing provided by these acts, such dollar authorization may be used at any installation for which family housing is authorized by the present bill.

The bill as originally submitted requested authority to construct 2,381 family housing units within and outside the United States; yet, as of January 31, 1957, the services had available construction authority for 35,672 units of which only 17,666 were completed, under contract, or under design. The remaining authority that is made available under this section is more than sufficient to meet this year's request for appropriated fund housing.

As a result of including this section, the committee deleted all sums related to family housing at each installation, however, it will be noted that the words "family housing" occur throughout the bill in order to make clear the location of the housing that is authorized.

Section 402

This section extends existing leasing authority for housing at tactical installations for 1 more year and increases that authority from 3,000 units, as provided in Public Law 968, 84th Congress, to a new total of 5,000 units. This is done so that Nike and other tactical site housing requirements may be met by utilizing existing private housing and thereby reducing the necessity for construction of military quarters at these installations. The committee feels that this is particularly appropriate because of the relative temporary location of many of these tactical sites.

Section 403

This section makes the current statutory floor area limitations applicable to housing authorized for construction with appropriated funds by repealing more restrictive limitations which apply to those units under Public Law 765, 83d Congress.

Section 404

This section provides that up to 15 percent of enlisted men's quarters may have a total floor area not to exceed 1,250 square feet, i. e., those with 4 bedrooms. Limitations on other units would remain the same. Past experience has demonstrated that an adequate 4-bedroom unit requires approximately 1,250 square feet of net floor space. The military departments testified that more than one-sixth of the married enlisted men in the upper grades with 7 or more years of service have families requiring 4-bedroom units.

Section 405

This section pertains to surplus-commodity program. It amends section 407 of Public Law 765, 83d Congress, in order to provide that housing allotments otherwise paid to, or rental charges collected from, civilian personnel will be available for payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation when such personnel occupy housing constructed under this program.

Section 406

This section provides that after June 30, 1958, all family housing units to be constructed or acquired under any provision of law must first be authorized and appropriated for by an annual military construction authorization act.

The committee's reason for inserting this section in the bill has been discussed fully in a previous portion of this report.

In addition, this section repeals the reporting provisions required by section 419, Public Law 968, 84th Congress, inasmuch as the reports would serve no useful purpose after June 30, 1958.

Section 407

This section will permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters, as has been described earlier in the report.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions in this year's bill are in the main similar to those contained in prior military construction acts. There are, however, some minor changes which are indicated.

Sections 501 to 505

Sections 501 through 505 repeat, with one exception, similar provisions in Public Law 968, 84th Congress, the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1957. The exception is the second sentence in section 505 which provides that the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

The committee realizes that in the construction field the Department of Defense is to be complimented on the fact that most construction contracts (93 percent during the 12-month period ending December 31, 1956) have been entered into as a result of competitive bidding. However, the committee feels that the Congress should be sufficiently advised in detail when there is a departure from normal practice.

Section 506

This section provides that unused authorities which have been in existence 4 years will be automatically rescinded. Past construction authorization acts have carried provisions automatically rescinding prior authority after a 5-year period. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the committee has been concerned over the large gap between authorizations and appropriations and believes that positive efforts must be taken to establish a better balance. As originally presented, the bill contained this routine 5-year provision and the committee seriously considered reducing the period to 3 years. However, following discussions with Defense officials, the committee concluded that a 4-year period would best suit the construction requirements at this time based on the understanding that the Department of Defense will recommend a 3-year period in subsequent bills.

Section 507

This section contains similar restrictions on unit costs to those provided in last year's bill. The only difference is that certain increases are provided in order to meet increased costs.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this proposed legislation will involve the expenditure of \$1,445,285,000. This amount is made up of \$1,203,-

413,000, representing the new authority contained in titles I, II, and III, plus \$181,099,000 representing the increases to prior authorities (deficiency authorizations), plus \$51,348,000 as the cost of the family housing authorized by the bill, plus \$9,425,000 for the Air Force Academy contained in section 508 of title V of the bill.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

This measure is part of the legislative program of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1958 and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as is evidenced by the letter dated May 1, 1957, from Secretary of Defense C. E. Wilson which is set out below and made a part of this report.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1957.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1957, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would authorize additional military construction that is urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for construction is provided for in the Budget of the United States Government for fiscal year 1958.

This legislation consists of title I, II and III, covering authorization required by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively; and title IV covering general provisions relating to this legislation.

This proposal would authorize new construction totaling \$1,561,338,000, of which \$323,325,000 is for the Department of the Army; \$435,099,000 is for the Department of the Navy; and \$802,914,000 is for the Department of the Air Force. This proposal would also provide additional monetary authority to correct deficiencies in authorization for projects authorized under previous laws totaling \$181,056,000, of which \$23,489,000 is for the Army; \$42,605,000 is for the Navy; and \$114,962,000 is for the Air Force. Therefore, the total in this proposed legislation of new authorization plus additional monetary authority for projects previously authorized amounts to \$1,742,394,000.

This proposal would also repeal all authorizations, with certain exceptions, for military construction that are contained in laws enacted after July 14, 1952, but prior to August 8, 1953. This repeal will continue in effect the policy established in the fiscal year 1956 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 161, 84th Cong.) and continued in the fiscal year 1957 act, of repealing longstanding authority that has not been exercised by the military departments. It is believed that the continuation of this policy will result in a construc-

tion program which will reflect more accurately the current needs of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alabama-----	\$11, 807, 000
Army:	
Anniston Ordnance Depot-----	2, 015, 000
Fort Rucker-----	7, 549, 000
Air Force:	
Craig Air Force Base, Selma-----	2, 193, 000
Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery-----	50, 000
Arizona-----	7, 010, 000
Army: Fort Huachuca-----	1, 936, 000
Air Force:	
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson-----	2, 361, 000
Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix-----	1, 848, 000
Williams Air Force Base, Chandler-----	865, 000
Arkansas-----	11, 510, 000
Air Force: Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville-----	11, 510, 000
California-----	120, 375, 000
Army:	
Jet Propulsion Laboratory-----	130, 000
Fort Ord-----	3, 307, 000
Sharpe General Depot-----	110, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Alameda-----	185, 000
Marine Corps supply center, Barstow-----	6, 841, 000
Auxiliary landing field, Crows Landing-----	39, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro-----	4, 310, 000
Marine Corps air station, El Toro-----	3, 411, 000
Naval air station, Lemoore-----	27, 535, 000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach-----	1, 500, 000
Naval station, Long Beach-----	544, 000
Naval air station, Miramar-----	3, 401, 000
Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave-----	3, 281, 000
Naval air station, North Island-----	7, 964, 000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton-----	1, 469, 000
Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu-----	7, 669, 000
Naval magazine, Port Chicago-----	236, 000
Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme-----	759, 000
Auxiliary landing field, San Clemente-----	9, 448, 000
Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego-----	116, 000
Naval training center, San Diego-----	1, 613, 000
Naval communication station, San Diego-----	100, 000
Naval communication center, Stockton-----	460, 000
Marine Corps training center, Twentynine Palms-----	2, 061, 000
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base, Marysville-----	7, 458, 000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced-----	2, 076, 000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc-----	1, 987, 000
George Air Force Base, Victorville-----	2, 478, 000
Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael-----	614, 000
March Air Force Base, Riverside-----	2, 347, 000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento-----	8, 249, 000
McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento-----	4, 912, 000
Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard (Camarillo)-----	1, 828, 000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield-----	1, 937, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Colorado.....	\$1, 986, 000
Army:	
Fort Carson.....	1, 049, 000
Fitzsimons Army Hospital.....	937, 000
Connecticut.....	2, 966, 000
Navy: Naval submarine base, New London.....	2, 966, 000
Delaware.....	745, 000
Air Force: Dover Air Force Base, Dover.....	745, 000
District of Columbia.....	1, 920, 000
Army: Walter Reed Army Medical Center.....	1, 920, 000
Florida.....	23, 010, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Cecil Field.....	5, 089, 000
Naval air station, Jacksonville.....	39, 000
Naval air station, Key West.....	1, 456, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Mayport.....	384, 000
Naval air station, Pensacola.....	2, 713, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Saufley Field.....	39, 000
Air Force:	
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso.....	5, 826, 000
Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead.....	380, 000
MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa.....	936, 000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa.....	2, 962, 000
Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City.....	3, 186, 000
Georgia.....	19, 355, 000
Army:	
Fort Benning.....	1, 583, 000
Atlanta General Depot.....	595, 000
Fort Stewart.....	3, 691, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps supply center, Albany.....	140, 000
Naval air station, Glynco.....	293, 000
Air Force:	
Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta.....	\$139, 000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah.....	994, 000
Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta.....	938, 000
Robins Air Force Base, Macon.....	2, 354, 000
Turner Air Force Base, Albany.....	8, 628, 000
Idaho.....	2, 022, 000
Air Force: Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home..	2, 022, 000
Illinois.....	8, 113, 000
Army:	
Granite City Engineer Depot.....	765, 000
Savanna Ordnance Depot.....	758, 000
Navy:	
Electronics supply office, Great Lakes.....	92, 000
Naval training center, Great Lakes.....	5, 598, 000
Air Force: Scott Air Force Base, Belleville.....	900, 000
Indiana.....	8, 966, 000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru.....	8, 966, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Iowa	\$248, 000
Air Force: Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City	248, 000
Kansas	5, 353, 000
Army:	
Fort Leavenworth	336, 000
Fort Riley	2, 525, 000
Air Force:	
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka	1, 357, 000
McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita	763, 000
Schilling Air Force Base, Salina	372, 000
Kentucky	9, 322, 000
Army:	
Fort Campbell	5, 117, 000
Fort Knox	4, 205, 000
Louisiana	16, 468, 000
Army: Fort Polk	7, 734, 000
Navy: Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia	3, 653, 000
Air Force:	
England Air Force Base, Alexandria	1, 558, 000
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport	3, 344, 000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles	179, 000
Maine	36, 366, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Brunswick	180, 000
Naval radio station, Washington County	13, 982, 000
Air Force:	
Dow Air Force Base, Bangor	14, 638, 000
Loring Air Force Base, Limestone	7, 322, 000
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle	244, 000
Maryland	9, 673, 000
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground	2, 288, 000
Fort Detrick	627, 000
Fort George G. Meade	589, 000
Fort Ritchie	820, 000
Navy:	
Naval Academy, Annapolis	1, 602, 000
Naval engineering experiment station, Annapolis	618, 000
Naval air station, Patuxent River	2, 209, 000
Air Force: Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs	920, 000
Massachusetts	\$12, 648, 000
Army: Fort Devens	6, 719, 000
Air Force:	
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford	3, 469, 000
Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth	559, 000
Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls	1, 901, 000
Michigan	6, 385, 000
Air Force:	
Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie	429, 000
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette	905, 000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens	2, 898, 000
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda	2, 153, 000
Minnesota	4, 499, 000
Air Force: Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth	4, 499, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Mississippi-----	\$37,305,000
Navy: Naval auxiliary air station, Meridian-----	13,387,000
Air Force:	
Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus-----	2,320,000
Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville-----	19,389,000
Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi-----	2,209,000
Missouri-----	6,618,000
Army: Fort Leonard Wood-----	4,663,000
Air Force:	
Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, St. Louis--	620,000
Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City-----	1,100,000
Whitman Air Force Base, Knobnoster-----	235,000
Montana-----	5,566,000
Air Force:	
Glasgow site-----	2,048,000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls-----	3,518,000
Nebraska-----	7,967,000
Army: Sioux Ordnance Depot-----	249,000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln-----	37,000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha-----	7,681,000
Nevada-----	6,786,000
Navy: Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon-----	4,199,000
Air Force:	
Indian Springs Air Force Base-----	206,000
Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas-----	436,000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno-----	1,945,000
New Hampshire-----	4,840,000
Army: Cold Regions Laboratory-----	2,496,000
Air Force: Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth-----	2,344,000
New Jersey-----	496,000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown-----	496,000
New Mexico-----	42,500,000
Army: White Sands Proving Ground-----	16,530,000
Air Force:	
Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis-----	\$2,149,000
Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo-----	11,869,000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell-----	9,676,000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque-----	2,276,000
New York-----	18,528,000
Army:	
Brooklyn Army Base-----	1,169,000
United States Military Academy-----	1,666,000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn-----	1,784,000
Air Force:	
Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome-----	10,410,000
Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead-----	337,000
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport-----	281,000
Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg-----	231,000
Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh-----	1,694,000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton-----	956,000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

North Carolina.....	\$24, 344, 000
Army: Fort Bragg.....	1, 051, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point.....	6, 503, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Edenton.....	160, 000
Naval seaplane facility, Hertford (Harvey Point).....	5, 728, 000
Marine Corps air facility, New River, Jacksonville.....	39, 000
Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune.....	872, 000
Air Force:	
Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro.....	9, 991, 000
North Dakota.....	11, 270, 000
Air Force:	
Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks.....	4, 466, 000
Minot Air Force Base, Minot.....	6, 804, 000
Ohio.....	3, 498, 000
Air Force:	
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus.....	1, 504, 000
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton.....	1, 777, 000
Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown.....	217, 000
Oklahoma.....	6, 035, 000
Air Force:	
Altus Air Force Base, Altus.....	848, 000
Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton.....	536, 000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City.....	2, 674, 000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid.....	1, 977, 000
Oregon.....	5, 067, 000
Air Force:	
Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath.....	1, 299, 000
Portland International Airport, Portland.....	3, 768, 000
Pennsylvania.....	2, 881, 000
Army: New Cumberland General Depot.....	464, 000
Navy:	
Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville.....	39, 000
Naval ordnance supply office, Mechanicsburg.....	155, 000
Aviation supply office, Philadelphia.....	550, 000
Air Force: Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown.....	1, 673, 000
Rhode Island.....	3, 611, 000
Navy:	
Naval station, Newport.....	2, 729, 000
Naval air station, Quonset Point.....	882, 000
South Carolina.....	9, 971, 000
Army: Charleston Transportation Corps Depot.....	306, 000
Navy:	
Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort.....	2, 632, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island.....	1, 142, 000
Air Force:	
Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston.....	2, 216, 000
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville.....	1, 287, 000
Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach.....	1, 204, 000
Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter.....	1, 184, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

South Dakota	\$2, 032, 000
Air Force:	
Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City	1, 976, 000
Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City	56, 000
Tennessee	673, 000
Air Force:	
McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville	189, 000
Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna	484, 000
Texas	43, 727, 000
Army:	
Fort Bliss	7, 704, 000
Fort Hood	2, 362, 000
Fort Worth General Depot	95, 000
Navy:	
Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field	566, 000
Naval air station, Corpus Christi	140, 000
Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville	160, 000
Air Force:	
Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo	2, 872, 000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin	1, 487, 000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso	5, 557, 000
Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio	952, 000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth	2, 059, 000
Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene	100, 000
Foster Air Force Base, Victoria	683, 000
Gray Air Force Base, Killeen	34, 000
Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen	262, 000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio	899, 000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio	250, 000
Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman	460, 000
Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio	2, 858, 000
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock	5, 909, 000
Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls	4, 200, 000
Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring	4, 118, 000
Utah	1, 965, 000
Army: Dugway Proving Ground	54, 000
Air Force: Hill Air Force Base, Ogden	1, 911, 000
Vermont	594, 000
Air Force: Ethan Allan Air Force Base, Winooski	594, 000
Virginia	23, 200, 000
Army:	
Fort Belvoir	1, 654, 000
Fort Eustis	562, 000
A. P. Hill Military Reservation	153, 000
Fort Lee	5, 417, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Chincoteague	2, 818, 000
Naval air station, Norfolk	39, 000
Naval communication station, Norfolk	443, 000
Public works center, Norfolk	3, 244, 000
Naval air station, Oceana	6, 975, 000
Marine Corps schools, Quantico	1, 875, 000
Air Force: Langley Air Force Base, Hampton	20, 000

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

Washington-----	\$52, 893, 000
Army:	
Fort Lewis-----	1, 487, 000
Seattle market center-----	40, 000
Navy:	
Naval ammunition depot, Bangor-----	316, 000
Naval shipyard, Bremerton-----	25, 438, 000
Naval air station, Whidbey Island-----	9, 365, 000
Air Force:	
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane-----	1, 480, 000
Geiger Field, Spokane-----	1, 583, 000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake-----	12, 552, 000
McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma-----	632, 000
Wisconsin-----	7, 934, 000
Air Force:	
Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville-----	7, 804, 000
Truax Field, Madison-----	130, 000
Various locations (Zone of Interior)-----	61, 510, 000
Army-----	9, 522, 000
Navy-----	5, 000, 000
Air Force-----	51, 988, 000
Classified (Zone of Interior):	
Army-----	125, 750, 000
Navy-----	31, 350, 000
Air Force-----	47, 000, 000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaska-----	29, 452, 000
Army:	
Alaska general-----	4, 143, 000
Eielson Air Force Base-----	
Fort Greely-----	
Ladd Air Force Base-----	
Fort Richardson-----	
Tactical sites-----	
Navy:	
Naval communication station, Adak-----	1, 053, 000
Naval station, Adak-----	2, 555, 000
Air Force:	
Eielson Air Force Base-----	430, 000
Elmendorf Air Force Base-----	4, 742, 000
Galena Airfield-----	350, 000
Ladd Air Force Base-----	1, 630, 000
(Canada) Newfoundland-----	14, 676, 000
Navy: Naval station, Argentia-----	14, 676, 000
Canal Zone-----	1, 689, 000
Army: Fort Gulick-----	289, 000
Air Force: Howard Air Force Base-----	1, 400, 000
Cuba-----	11, 522, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay-----	5, 730, 000
Naval station, Guantanamo Bay-----	4, 699, 000
Public works center, Guantanamo Bay-----	1, 093, 000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES—Continued

France-----	\$20, 754, 000
Army: Various locations-----	20, 754, 000
Mariana Islands-----	820, 000
Air Force: Andersen Air Force Base-----	820, 000
Guam-----	1, 906, 000
Navy:	
Naval station-----	884, 000
Naval air station, Agana-----	428, 000
Naval communication station, Finegayan-----	594, 000
Hawaii-----	16, 837, 000
Army: Tripler Army Hospital-----	154, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Barbers Point-----	2, 088, 000
Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay-----	249, 000
Headquarters, commander in chief, Pacific and Pacific Fleet, Oahu-----	332, 000
Naval ammunition depot, Oahu-----	326, 000
Naval shipyard, Pearl Harbor-----	1, 297, 000
Naval radio station, Wahiawa-----	4, 392, 000
Air Force: Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu-----	2, 228, 000
Japan-----	795, 000
Navy:	
Naval activity, Sakata-----	69, 000
Naval security group, southern Japan-----	726, 000
Korea-----	9, 000, 000
Army: Various locations-----	9, 000, 000
Kwajalein-----	69, 000
Navy: Naval station, Kwajalein-----	69, 000
Midway-----	69, 000
Navy: Naval station, Midway Island-----	69, 000
Okinawa-----	504, 000
Navy: Naval air facility, Naha-----	504, 000
Philippines-----	14, 920, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Cubi Point-----	149, 000
Naval base, Subic Bay-----	1, 750, 000
Naval station, Subic Bay-----	7, 576, 000
Naval supply depot, Subic Bay-----	397, 000
Public Works Center, Subic Bay-----	393, 000
Puerto Rico-----	18, 620, 000
Army: Fort Buchanan-----	137, 000
Navy:	
Naval air station, Roosevelt Roads-----	15, 182, 000
Naval station, San Juan-----	190, 000
Air Force: Ramey Air Force Base-----	3, 783, 000
Various locations, overseas-----	148, 782, 000
Navy-----	130, 000
Air Force-----	148, 652, 000

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

[Report No. 842]

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957

AUGUST 8 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957

Reported by Mr. STENNIS, with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities for acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
7 manent or temporary public works, including the prepara-
8 tion, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following
9 projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL GROUND FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
\$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,-
000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,-
000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
\$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,-
530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

1 Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:

2 Land acquisition, \$40,000.

3 Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,

4 and utilities, \$110,000.

5 Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,

6 and land acquisition, \$95,000.

7 (Chemical Corps)

8 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-
10 000.

11 (Signal Corps)

12 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

13 (Corps of Engineers)

14 Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-
15 search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

16 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training
17 facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

18 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
19 000.

20 (Transportation Corps)

21 Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
22 \$1,169,000.

23 Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
24 facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
14 utilities, \$4,859,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,703,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

1 (Fifth Army Area)

2 Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

3 Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

4 Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance
5 facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000

6 Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing,
7 \$4,663,000.

8 (Sixth Army Area)

9 Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance
10 facilities, administrative facilities, community facility,
11 and utilities, \$1,487,000.

12 Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance
13 facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,231,000.

14 (Military Academy)

15 United States Military Academy, West Point, New
16 York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

17 (Armed Forces Special Weapons)

18 Various installations: Operational facility, community
19 facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

20 (Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

21 Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance fa-
22 cilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community
23 facilities, troop housing, family housng, and utilities,
24 \$8,466,000,

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
5 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
6 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
7 military tactical installations for assignment as public
8 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
9 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
10 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
11 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
12 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
13 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
14 structed with appropriated funds.

15 SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
16 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
17 STATES" in section 101, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
19 TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,
20 Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,212,000".

22 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as

amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts “\$44,003,000” and “\$133,671,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,000”, respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$2,360,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,137,000”.

Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Military Academy)” with respect to United States Military Academy, New York, strike out “\$9,950,000” and insert in place thereof “\$11,983,000”.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts “\$129,096,000” and “\$236,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$131,906,000” and “238,870,000”, respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,

1 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
2 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

3 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
4 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

5 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,
6 Maryland, strike out “\$1,736,000” and insert in place
7 thereof “\$2,039,000”.

8 (2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
9 York, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$212,000”.

11 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
12 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)” with respect to Fort Lee,
13 Virginia, strike out “\$8,589,000” and insert in place thereof
14 “\$9,874,000”.

15 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
16 TIES (Chemical Corps)”—

17 (1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,
18 strike out “\$452,000” and insert in place thereof
19 “\$525,000”.

20 (2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,
21 Utah, strike out “\$1,129,000” and insert in place
22 thereof “\$1,491,000”.

23 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
24 TIES (Transportation Corps)”—

25 (1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New

York, strike out “\$1,055,000” and insert in place thereof
 “\$1,240,000”.

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out
 “\$6,597,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,072,000”.

Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES (Med-
 ical Corps)”—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
 Texas, strike out “\$549,000” and insert in place thereof
 “\$876,000”.

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash-
 ington, strike out “\$333,000” and insert in place thereof
 “\$669,000”.

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
 Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$3,557,000”
 and insert in place thereof “\$4,472,000”.

Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sec-
 ond Army Area)”—with respect to Fort Holabird, Mary-
 land, strike out “\$612,000” and insert in place thereof
 “\$800,000”.

Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 (Third Army Area)”—with respect to Camp Jackson, South
 Carolina, strike out “\$5,000,000” and insert in place thereof
 “\$10,400,000”.

Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 (Fourth Army Area)”—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,

1 strike out “\$12,922,000” and insert in place thereof
2 “\$14,283,000”.

3 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
4 (Fifth Army Area)”—

5 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
6 out “\$7,487,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,621,
7 000”.

8 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
9 strike out “\$8,615,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “9,893,000”.

11 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
12 out “\$145,000” and insert in place thereof “\$193,000”.

13 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
14 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)”—with respect
15 to various installations, strike out “\$3,014,000” and insert
16 in place thereof “\$3,204,000”.

17 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
19 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101 as follows:

20 Under the subheading “Alaskan Area”—with respect to
21 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out “\$469,000” and insert
22 in place thereof “\$559,000”.

23 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
24 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
25 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and

1 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$240,220,
2 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$549,287,000”, respectively.

3 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
4 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
5 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

6 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
7 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

8 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
9 York, strike out “\$88,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$136,000”.

11 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
12 strike out “\$6,159,000” and insert in place thereof
13 “\$8,593,000”.

14 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
15 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—

16 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
17 out “\$832,000” and insert in place thereof “\$984,000”.

18 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
19 Texas, strike out “\$1,285,000” and insert in place
20 thereof “\$1,847,000”.

21 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES”—

22 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
23 “\$5,301,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,293,000”.

24 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
25 “\$4,173,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,798,000”.

1 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas;
2 strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof
3 "\$1,373,000".

4 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
5 amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,
6 782,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000".

7 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
8 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
9 tion 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and
10 "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,-
11 000", "\$203,331,000", and "\$334,104,000", respectively.

12 TITLE II

13 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
14 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
15 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
16 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
17 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
18 projects:

19 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

20 ~~SHIPYARD FACILITIES~~

21 Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis,
22 Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

23 Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock
24 ~~\$25,438,000.~~

25 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
26 \$1,452,000.

1 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderoek, Maryland:
2 Utilities, \$115,000.

3 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
4 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$1,500,000.

5 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
6 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

7 Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,
8 998,000.

9 Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
10 facilities, \$391,000.

11 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

12 Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,
13 \$1,326,000.

14 Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
15 facilities, \$544,000.

16 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
17 community facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

18 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
19 \$7,808,000.

20 AVIATION FACILITIES

21 (Naval Air Training Stations)

22 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Oper-
23 ational facilities, \$566,000.

24 Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational
25 facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

2 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-
3 tional facilities, (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

4 Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
5 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,-
6 067,000.

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana:
8 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

9 Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational
10 facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,-
11 225,000.

12 Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida:
13 Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
14 \$39,000.

15 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

16 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational
17 facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

18 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational
19 facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
21 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
22 \$7,751,000.

23 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Califor-
24 nia: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
25 \$39,000.

1 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:
2 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

3 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:
4 Operational facilities, messhall, and land acquisition,
5 \$4,774,000.

6 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-
7 ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

8 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
9 Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,
10 and utilities, \$5,728,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
12 facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

13 Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational
14 facilities, (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
16 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
18 tional facilities, \$384,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
20 cilities, \$3,401,000.

21 Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
22 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

23 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
24 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and
2 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
3 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

4 Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
5 tional facilities, (aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

6 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,
7 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
8 utilities, \$9,448,000.

9 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Op-
10 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

11 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

12 Marine Corps Auxiliary, Air Station, Beaufort, South
13 Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
14 istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

15 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
16 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
17 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
18 improvements, \$6,503,000.

19 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-
20 tional facilities, \$3,620,000.

21 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California:
22 Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

23 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
24 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$2,209,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$3,479,000.

Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field (location to be determined): Land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

~~SUPPLY FACILITIES~~

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

~~MARINE CORPS FACILITIES~~

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,001,000.

1 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina:
 2 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and util-
 3 ities, \$4,256,000.

4 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
 5 lina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facili-
 6 ties, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

7 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
 8 tional facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

9 Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community
 10 facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
 11 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

12 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
 13 Training facilities, \$116,000.

14 Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms,
 15 California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-
 16 istrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

17 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

18 Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utili-
 19 ties, \$316,000.

20 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
 21 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

22 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
 23 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

24 Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
 25 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

1 Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Mary-
2 land: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

3 Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance
4 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

5 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

6 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory
7 foundations, \$1,602,000.

8 Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, South Carolina:
9 Troop housing, \$1,225,000.

10 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training
11 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

12 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training
13 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,375,000.

14 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

15 Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-
16 ational facilities, \$443,000.

17 Naval Communication Station, Newport, Rhode Island:
18 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

19 Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:
20 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

21 Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Op-
22 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

23 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Op-
24 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

1 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

2 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
3 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

4 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

5 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
6 000.

7 Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
8 244,000.

9 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,
10 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
11 \$759,000.

12 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

13 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

14 Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
15 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
16 076, 000.

17 Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
18 Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and
19 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

20 Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
21 Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
22 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

23 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

24 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
25 munity facilities, and family housing \$1,005,000.

1 Commander in Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
2 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administration facilities and
3 utilities, \$332,000.

4 Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,-
5 699,000.

6 Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
7 000.

8 ~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~

9 Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
10 erational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,
11 000.

12 Naval Station, Argentina, Canada: Family housing and
13 community facilities, \$1,793,000.

14 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
15 Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),
16 \$2,088,000.

17 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-
18 lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational
20 facilities, \$5,730,000.

21 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
22 tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

23 Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
24 facilities (Tactical air navigation facilities), \$69,000.

1 Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
2 Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),
3 \$69,000.

4 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facili-
5 ties at White Beach, \$504,000.

6 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Oper-
7 ational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-
8 ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

9 SUPPLY FACILITIES

10 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
11 \$1,550,000.

12 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
13 facilities, \$884,000.

14 Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
15 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000.

16 ~~ORDNANCE FACILITIES~~

17 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
18 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
19 \$904,000.

20 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

21 Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop
22 housing, \$1,053,000.

23 Naval Station, Argentina, Canada: Operational facilities,
24 and troop housing, \$898,000.

1 Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mari-
2 ana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

3 Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Op-
4 erational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

5 Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Opera-
6 tional facilities, \$69,000.

7 Naval Security Group Activity, southern Japan: Op-
8 erational facilities, housing, and utilities and ground im-
9 provements, \$726,000.

10 Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of
11 Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

12 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

13 Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
14 \$1,093,000.

15 Public Works Center, Subie Bay, Luzon, Philippine Is-
16 lands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

17 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
18 develop classified naval installations and facilities by con-
19 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
20 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
21 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
22 total amount of \$65,091,000.

23 SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-

gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES", with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,927,000".

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California, strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, strike out "\$1,675,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,030,000"; and with respect to the Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out "\$70,000" and insert in place thereof "\$170,000".

1 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 2 amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,
 3 358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

4 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 5 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section
 6 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,
 7 807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,
 8 555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

9 SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 10 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
 11 UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

12 (1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,
 13 with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Cali-
 14 fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof
 15 “\$1,099,000”.

16 (2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
 17 with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out
 18 “\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.

19 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 20 -(Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
 21 Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out “\$3,686,
 22 000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,292,000”; and with
 23 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia,
 24 Louisiana, strike out “\$24,361,000” and insert in place
 25 thereof “\$26,871,000”.

1 (4) Under the subheading "~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~
 2 ~~(Fleet Support Air Stations)~~", with respect to the Naval
 3 Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000"
 4 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
 5 the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
 6 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
 7 and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,
 8 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
 9 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

10 (5) Under the subheading "~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~
 11 ~~(Special Purpose Air Stations)~~", with respect to the Naval
 12 Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,
 13 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,444".—

14 (6) Under the subheading "~~ORDNANCE FACILITIES~~",
 15 with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,
 16 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
 17 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval
 18 Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out
 19 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

20 (7) Under the subheading "~~SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-~~
 21 ~~TIES~~" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian
 22 Head, Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place
 23 thereof "\$879,000".

24 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
2 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

3 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
4 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall
5 Islands, strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof
6 "\$5,235,000".

7 (2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILI-
8 TIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
9 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and
10 insert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

11 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
12 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,
13 342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

14 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
15 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
16 tion 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300",
17 "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting re-
18 spectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,
19 300", "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

20 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
21 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
22 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

23 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
24 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-

1 line, strike out “\$148,000” and insert in place thereof
 2 “\$191,000”; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
 3 Beach, California, strike out “\$5,984,000” and insert in
 4 place thereof “\$8,169,000”.

5 (2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,
 6 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
 7 strike out “\$2,256,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,
 8 623,000”; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
 9 Virginia, strike out “\$2,844,000” and insert in place thereof
 10 “\$3,340,000”.

11 (3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 12 (Fleet Support Air Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
 13 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out “\$8,835,000”
 14 and insert in place thereof “\$11,040,000”.

15 (4) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES
 16 (Special Purpose Air Stations)”, with respect to the Naval
 17 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
 18 “\$1,682,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,010,000”.

19 (5) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 20 TIES” with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
 21 land, strike out “\$7,469,000” and insert in place thereof
 22 “\$10,919,000”.

23 (6) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-
 24 ITIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Station,

1 San Francisco, California, strike out “\$2,029,000” and in-
 2 sert in place thereof “\$3,779,000”.

3 (7) Under the subheading “YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
 4 TIES”, with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
 5 Virginia, strike out “\$443,000” and insert in place thereof
 6 “\$500,000”.

7 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 8 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES”
 9 in section 201, as follows:

10 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”,
 11 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
 12 out “\$1,961,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,337,000”.

13 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 14 amended by striking out in section 203, “\$84,043,000” and
 15 inserting in place thereof “\$85,939,000”.

16 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 17 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
 18 amounts “\$292,572,000”, “\$61,625,000”, “\$84,043,000”,
 19 and “\$438,240,000” and inserting respectively in place
 20 thereof “\$303,453,000”, “\$62,001,000”, “\$85,939,000”,
 21 and “\$451,393,000”.

22 TITLE III

23 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
 24 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-

1 ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
2 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
3 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
4 ing projects:

5 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

6 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

7 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
9 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
10 \$4,499,000.

11 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Op-
12 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
13 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

14 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facili-
15 ties, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and
16 land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

17 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family
20 housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
21 improvements, \$2,048,000.

22 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
23 Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
24 cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community
25 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

1 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
 2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
 3 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
 4 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

5 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
 6 Operatonal and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
 7 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

8 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
 9 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
 10 ground improvements, \$429,000.

11 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
 12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
 13 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
 14 \$905,000.

15 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
 16 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
 17 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
 18 \$1,299,000.

19 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
 20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
 21 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

22 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
 23 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

24 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
3 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
4 ments, \$6,804,000.

5 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
6 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

8 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
9 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
10 and ground improvements, \$2,074,000.

11 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-
12 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
13 troop housing community facilities, and utilities and ground
14 improvements, \$2,082,000.

15 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land ac-
16 quisition, \$136,000.

17 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
19 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
20 \$4,328,000.

21 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
22 Community facilities, \$244,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
24 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
25 ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

1 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
2 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
3 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

4 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

6 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply
7 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
8 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

9 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
10 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
11 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

12 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
13 utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real
14 estate improvements, \$1,128,000.

15 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

18 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
20 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
21 and ground improvement, \$2,909,000.

22 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
23 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$358,000.

25 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
2 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
3 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
4 \$48,178,000.

5 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

6 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
7 housing, \$405,000.

8 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development,
10 and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
11 troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
12 and land acquisition, \$10,659,000.

13 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
14 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

15 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance
16 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
17 \$899,000.

18 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
19 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

20 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
24 \$5,133,000.

1 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
2 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

3 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
5 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
6 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

7 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:
8 Community facilities, \$56,000.

9 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
10 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop
11 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

12 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:
13 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
14 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
15 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
16 \$2,077,000.

17 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

18 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research
19 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
21 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-
24 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test

1 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
 2 provements, \$1,987,000.

3 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
 4 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
 5 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
 6 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

7 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
 8 Community facilities, \$206,000.

9 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
 10 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
 11 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

12 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
 13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
 14 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
 15 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
 16 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

17 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
 18 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
 19 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
 20 improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,962,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
 23 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
 24 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
 25 and land acquisition, \$4,785,000.

1 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

3 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
5 \$489,000.

6 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
7 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

8 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
9 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
10 ties, \$2,209,000.

11 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
12 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
13 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

14 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
17 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

18 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

21 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
23 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

24 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
25 facilities, \$436,000.

1 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

3 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

6 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
8 \$5,909,000.

9 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Utilities and
10 ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate
11 improvements, \$653,000.

12 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
15 \$4,200,000.

16 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
17 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

18 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
20 \$1,977,000.

21 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements
24 \$4,118,000.

25 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-

1 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$865,000.

3 AIR UNIVERSITY

4 Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land
5 acquisition, \$50,000.

6 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

7 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical
8 facilities, \$952,000.

9 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

11 Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-
12 ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
13 \$337,000.

14 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

15 Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,
16 Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

17 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
18 Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

19 Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-
20 lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$2,216,000.

22 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$2,089,000.

25 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

1 Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
2 and land acquisition, \$496,000.

3 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

4 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
5 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
6 facilities, \$848,000.

7 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
10 \$3,344,000.

11 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
13 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

15 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
16 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
17 facilities, \$1,487,000.

18 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$5,557,000.

21 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
22 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
23 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
24 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

25 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$9,584,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground
9 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
10 ments, \$2,976,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

24 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
25 and training facilities, \$250,000.

1 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
2 acquisition, \$37,000.

3 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

6 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
8 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.—

9 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
11 ground improvements, \$936,000.

12 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
13 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

15 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

17 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
18 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

20 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

24 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:

1 Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$231,000.

3 Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-
4 shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

6 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
8 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
9 \$3,892,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,528,000.

14 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

17 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

21 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
22 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$1,901,000.

25 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-

1 ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$235,000.

3 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

4 Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and land
6 acquisition, \$2,149,000.

8 Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina:
9 Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,287,000.

11 England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop
12 housing, community facilities and land acquisition, \$1,
13 558,000.

14 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
15 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$760,000.

17 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply
18 facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

19 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

21 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
22 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
23 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
24 \$1,204,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
2 facilities, \$745,000.

3 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
6 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
7 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,558,000.

8 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
9 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

10 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$2,035,000.

12 SPECIAL FACILITIES

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 \$229,000.

15 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

23 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
24 ties, \$430,000.

25 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training

1 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$4,742,000.

3 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
4 \$350,000.

5 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

6 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
7 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
8 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
9 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acqui-
10 sition, \$11,500,000.

11 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

12 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
13 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

14 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

15 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
16 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

17 FAR EAST AIR FORCES

18 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational
19 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
20 ties, \$2,642,000.

21 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
22 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$12,738,000.

1 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
4 utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

5 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

6 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities,
7 \$820,000.

8 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
9 training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground
10 improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$59,613,000.

15 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
20 improvements, \$39,217,000.

21 SPECIAL FACILITIES

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 \$170,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$70,000,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof

1 “\$12,686,000”; and strike out “\$1,463,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$2,756,000”.

3 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
4 MAND”—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
5 stead, New York, strike out “\$729,000” and insert in place
6 thereof “\$929,000”; and strike out “\$686,000” and insert
7 in place thereof “\$886,000”.

8 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
9 COMMAND”—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
10 Muroc, California, strike out “\$27,478,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$29,442,000”; and strike out “\$16,192,000”
12 and insert in place thereof “\$18,156,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
15 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
16 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
17 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

18 SEC. 304.(a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

21 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

22 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
23 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

25 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-

kota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$9,220,000";

(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000" and
insert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike
out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,
000";

(5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-
nard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in
place thereof "\$2,935,000";

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,
Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and
insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-
port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and in-
sert in place thereof "\$893,000";

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,
Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place
thereof "\$2,676,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,
Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert
in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,

1 New York, strike out “\$15,803,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$16,654,000”;

3 (3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,
4 Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and
5 insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;

6 (4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force
7 Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.

9 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

10 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
11 Houston, Texas, strike out “\$3,438,000” and insert
12 in place thereof “\$3,876,000”;

13 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
14 San Angelo, Texas, strike out “\$4,081,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$5,088,000”;

16 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
17 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out “\$500,000 and insert
18 in place thereof “\$545,000”;

19 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
20 Harlingen, Texas, strike out “\$446,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$529,000”;

22 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
23 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out “\$883,000” and insert
24 in place thereof “\$1,129,000”;

25 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,

1 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and
 2 insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

3 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
 4 bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in
 5 place thereof "\$1,304,000";

6 (8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base,
 7 Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert
 8 in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

9 Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"
 10 with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, Dis-
 11 trict of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place
 12 thereof "\$825,000".

13 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
 14 COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force
 15 Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada,
 16 strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,
 17 500".

18 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

19 (1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort
 20 Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in
 21 place thereof "\$7,363,000".

22 (2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor,
 23 Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place
 24 thereof "\$12,218,000";

25 (3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fair-

1 field, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in
2 place thereof "\$11,473,000";

3 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
4 well, New Mexico, strike out "\$6,657,000" and insert
5 in place thereof "\$8,324,000".

6 Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—

7 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
8 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out "\$2,684,000" and
9 insert in place thereof "\$3,527,000";

10 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
11 Peru, Indiana, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place
12 thereof "\$611,000";

13 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
14 ville, California, strike out "\$1,598,000" and insert in
15 place thereof "\$1,905,000";

16 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
17 Lake, Washington, strike out "\$4,724,000" and insert
18 in place thereof "\$5,197,000";

19 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
20 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out "\$3,589,000" and insert
21 in place thereof "\$4,010,000".

22 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
23 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CON-
24 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

25 Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND"—

1 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
 2 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

3 Under the subheading “~~AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL~~
 4 ~~AIDS~~” with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,
 5 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

6 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
 8 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
 9 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$824,
 10 300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”, re-
 11 spectively.

12 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 13 is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED
 14 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

15 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

16 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
 17 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert in
 18 place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

19 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
 20 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
 21 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

22 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
 23 gow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert in
 24 place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

25 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,

1 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
2 and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

3 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
4 Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-
5 sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;

6 (6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
7 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;

9 (7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
10 port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;

12 (8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
13 North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in
14 place thereof “\$27,035,000”;

15 (9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
16 port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”
17 and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;

18 (10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
19 Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-
20 sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;

21 (11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
22 Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert
23 in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;

24 (12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-

consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,726,000”;

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out “\$3,278,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,808,000”;

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out “\$21,510,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,201,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out “\$17,966,000” and insert in place thereof “\$22,005,000”;

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out “\$473,000” and insert in place thereof “\$745,000”;

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof “\$251,000”;

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out “\$5,990,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,763,000”.

Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base,

1 Amarillo, Texas, strike out "\$17,121,000" and insert
2 in place thereof "\$26,471,000";

3 (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,
4 Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place
5 thereof "\$22,000";

6 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
7 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and
8 insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

9 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
10 Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place
11 thereof "\$3,063,000";

12 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
13 Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place
14 thereof "\$1,064,000".

15 Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY" with respect
16 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
17 out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

18 Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
19 MAND"—

20 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
21 ville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert
22 in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

23 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
24 etta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place
25 thereof, "\$500,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field,
Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,939,000" and
insert in place thereof "\$7,530,000";

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
Muroc, California, strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert
in place thereof "\$7,220,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso,
Texas, strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$1,190,000";

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced,
California, strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place
thereof "\$2,643,000";

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base,
Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "\$14,518,000" and
insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base,
Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out "\$943,000" and
insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base,
Homestead, Florida, strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert
in place thereof "\$1,966,000";

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base,

1 Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

3 (7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,
4 Great Falls, Montana, strike out “\$1,236,000” and
5 insert in place thereof “\$1,586,00”;

6 (8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
7 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$2,064,000”
8 and insert in place thereof “\$2,607,000”;

9 (9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
10 Nebraska, strike out “\$5,697,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$6,155,000”;

12 (10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,
13 Plattsburgh, New York, strike out “\$1,491,000” and
14 insert in place thereof “\$2,027,000”;

15 (11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
16 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$661,000”
17 and insert in place thereof “\$720,000”;

18 (12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,
19 Roswell, New Mexico, strike out “\$2,791,000” and
20 insert in place thereof “\$3,181,000”.

21 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—
22 with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-
23 ginia, strike out “\$2,613,000” and insert in place thereof
24 “\$2,785,000”.

25 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is

1 amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED
2 STATES" as follows:

3 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—
4 with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000"
5 and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

6 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
7 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
8 amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,-
9 934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000",
10 "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

11 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
12 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
13 read as follows:

14 "(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
15 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
16 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
17 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
18 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
19 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
20 in the next military construction authorization Act would
21 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
22 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
23 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
24 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
25 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:

1 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
2 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the
3 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon
4 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
5 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
6 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

7 TITLE IV

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
10 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
11 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
12 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
13 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.
14 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
15 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
16 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.
17 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
18 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
19 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.
20 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
21 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
22 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
23 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

24 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such

1 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
 2 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
 3 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

4 ~~(1)~~ for title I: Inside the United States, \$120,-
 5 099,000; outside the United States, \$34,613,000; see-
 6 tion 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$297,714,000;

7 ~~(2)~~ for title II: Inside the United States, \$260,-
 8 377,000; outside the United States, \$65,627,000; see-
 9 tion 202, \$65,091,000; or a total of \$391,095,000; and

10 ~~(3)~~ for title III: Inside the United States, \$437,-
 11 357,000; outside the United States, \$225,407,000; see-
 12 tion 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$727,764,000.

13 SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or
 14 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
 15 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the
 16 United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
 17 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
 18 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
 19 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

20 SEC. 404. Whenever—

21 ~~(1)~~ the President determines that compliance with
 22 section 2313 ~~(b)~~ of title 10, United States Code, for
 23 contracts made under this Act for the establishment

1 or development of military installations and facilities in
2 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out
3 of this Act; and

4 ~~(2)~~ the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
5 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
6 quately auditing those contracts;

7 the President may exempt those contracts from the require-
8 ments of that section.

9 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
10 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
11 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
12 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
13 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
14 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
15 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall
16 report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the
17 Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to
18 all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to
19 the lowest responsible bidder.

20 SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
21 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary
22 of a military department in connection with the establish-
23 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
24 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
25 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and

1 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
2 tion are repealed, except—

3 ~~(1)~~ authorizations for public works and for appro-
4 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
5 titles that contain the general provisions;

6 ~~(2)~~ the authorization for public works projects as
7 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
8 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
9 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

10 ~~(3)~~ the authorization for the rental guaranty for
11 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
12 contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-
13 second Congress;

14 ~~(4)~~ the authorizations for public works and the
15 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
16 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
17 ~~(50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886)~~;

18 ~~(5)~~ the authorization for the development of the
19 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
20 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
21 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

22 ~~(6)~~ Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
23 of the Act of August 3, 1956 ~~(70 Stat. 991, 1016)~~,
24 the authorization for ~~(a)~~ development of classified fa-
25 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in

1 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
2 ~~(65 Stat. 336, 343)~~, and ~~(b)~~ development of classified
3 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
4 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
5 ~~(66 Stat. 606, 609)~~; and

6 ~~(7)~~ the authorization for public works and for the
7 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
8 of April 1, 1954 ~~(68 Stat. 47)~~, as amended.

9 SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 ~~(69~~
10 ~~Stat. 324, 352)~~, as amended, is further amended to read
11 as follows:

12 "SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
13 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
14 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
15 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
16 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
17 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
18 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
19 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
20 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
21 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
22 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
23 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
24 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
25 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

1 SEC. 408. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
2 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-
3 ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor
4 area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774,
5 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

6 (b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68
7 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

8 SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
9 follows:

10 (a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following
11 new subsection at the end thereof:

12 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
13 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
14 the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
15 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

16 (b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following
17 new subsection at the end thereof:

18 “(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
19 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members
20 of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
21 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

22 (c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following
23 new subsection at the end thereof:

24 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
25 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of

1 the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net
2 floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

3 SEC. 410. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
4 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
5 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

6 "The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
7 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
8 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
9 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
10 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
11 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
12 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
13 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
14 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
15 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
16 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of
17 the foreign currencies used for all such construction or
18 acquisition."

19 SEC. 411. Prior to the termination of, or reduction in
20 the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity
21 being conducted on the date of enactment of this Act within
22 any of the forty-eight States or the District of Columbia
23 (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such
24 termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the
25 supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished

1 by other than civilian employees of the United States, and
2 where such activity has been conducted for five or more
3 years and requires the services of ten or more civilian em-
4 ployees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the Presi-
5 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
6 sentatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed
7 termination or reduction. Such proposed termination or
8 reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of sixty
9 days of continuous session of the Congress following the
10 filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during
11 such sixty days either House of the Congress has adopted
12 a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed
13 termination or reduction described in such report. For the
14 purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be con-
15 sidered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the
16 computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded
17 the days on which either House is not in session because of
18 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

19 SEC. 412. The authority granted by section 2304 (a)-
20 (1), title 10, United States Code, shall not be exercised
21 during the national emergency declared by the President on
22 December 16, 1950, except with respect to—

23 (1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of
24 which does not involve more than \$2,500;

1 ~~(2)~~ purchases or contracts for nonperishable sub-
 2 sistence supplies;

3 ~~(3)~~ purchases or contracts for property or services
 4 for experimental, developmental, or research work, or
 5 making or furnishing property for experiment, test,
 6 development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000.

7 ~~(4)~~ when in furtherance of small business, labor
 8 surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency
 9 head determines that supplies or services are to be pro-
 10 cured from small business concerns, from concerns which
 11 will perform the contracts substantially within labor
 12 surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor,
 13 or from concerns which will perform the contracts sub-
 14 stantially within areas of major disaster.

15 SEC. 413. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
 16 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the
 17 Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August
 18 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing
 19 shall be available for the construction of family housing at
 20 any installations for which family housing is authorized to
 21 be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

22 SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
 23 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out
 24 in the first sentence the figure “\$126,000,000” and insert-
 25 ing in place thereof the figure “\$147,341,000”.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, \$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility, \$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,417,000.

Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington: Land acquisition, \$40,000.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$110,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility, and land acquisition, \$95,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Research and development facility, \$2,496,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

*Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
000.*

(Transportation Corps)

*Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
\$1,169,000.*

*Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
facilities, \$306,000.*

*Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
ing, and utilities, \$562,000.*

(Medical Corps)

*Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
housing, \$937,000.*

*Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.:
Utilities, \$1,920,000.*

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

*Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
utilities, \$6,719,000.*

(Second Army Area)

*A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
ing, \$153,000.*

*Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.*

1 *Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Community facili-*
2 *ties, \$589,000.*

3 *Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.*

4 *(Third Army Area)*

5 *Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and main-*
6 *tenance facilities, \$1,583,000.*

7 *Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and mainte-*
8 *nance facilities, \$1,051,000.*

9 *Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, main-*
10 *tenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities,*
11 *\$5,117,000.*

12 *Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop*
13 *housing, \$7,549,000.*

14 *Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.*

15 *(Fourth Army Area)*

16 *Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facili-*
17 *ties, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility,*
18 *administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,*
19 *and utilities, \$7,704,000.*

20 *Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facili-*
21 *ties, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, com-*
22 *munity facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.*

23 *Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, mainte-*
24 *nance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.*

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,307,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

1 (*OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES*)

2 (*Alaskan Area*)

3 *Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely,*
4 *Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical instal-*
5 *lations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-*
6 *istrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.*

7 (*Pacific Command Area*)

8 *Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities,*
9 *\$154,000.*

10 (*Caribbean Command Area*)

11 *Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$137,000.*

12 *Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.*

13 (*United States Army, Europe*)

14 *Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage*
15 *facilities, \$20,754,000.*

16 (*Army Forces Far East*)

17 *Various installations: Operational facilities, training*
18 *facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop*
19 *housing, community facilities, administrative facilities,*
20 *medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.*

21 *SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or*
22 *develop classified military installations and facilities by ac-*
23 *quiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing*

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 *SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to*
5 *purchase out of appropriations available for military con-*
6 *struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,*
7 *military tactical installations for assignment as public*
8 *quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not*
9 *more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased*
10 *under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in*
11 *accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section*
12 *4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations*
13 *as now or hereafter established for military housing con-*
14 *structed with appropriated funds.*

15 *SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,*
16 *is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED*
17 *STATES" in section 101, as follows:*

18 *Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
19 *TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,*
20 *Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof*
21 *"\$2,212,000".*

22 *(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as*
23 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section*
24 *502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and*

1 inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,-
2 000", respectively.

3 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
4 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
5 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

6 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
7 TIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Department of the
8 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
9 land, strike out "\$2,360,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$3,137,000".

11 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Military Academy)" with respect to United States Military
13 Academy, New York, strike out "\$9,950,000" and insert
14 in place thereof "\$11,983,000".

15 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
16 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
17 tion 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000"
18 and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,-
19 870,000", respectively.

20 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
21 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
22 UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

23 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
24 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

25 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,

1 *Maryland, strike out “\$1,736,000” and insert in place*
 2 *thereof “\$2,039,000”.*

3 *(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New*
 4 *York, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof*
 5 *“\$212,000”.*

6 *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
 7 *TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—with respect to Fort Lee,*
 8 *Virginia, strike out “\$8,589,000” and insert in place thereof*
 9 *“\$9,874,000”.*

10 *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
 11 *TIES (Chemical Corps)”—*

12 *(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,*
 13 *strike out “\$452,000” and insert in place thereof*
 14 *“\$525,000”.*

15 *(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,*
 16 *Utah, strike out “\$1,129,000” and insert in place*
 17 *thereof “\$1,491,000”.*

18 *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
 19 *TIES (Transportation Corps)”—*

20 *(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New*
 21 *York, strike out “\$1,055,000” and insert in place*
 22 *thereof “\$1,240,000”.*

23 *(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike*
 24 *out “\$6,597,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,-*
 25 *072,000”.*

1 Under the subheading “*TECHNICAL SERVICES (Med-*
2 *ical Corps)*”—

3 (1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
4 Texas, strike out “\$549,000” and insert in place thereof
5 “\$876,000”.

6 (2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash-
7 ington, strike out “\$333,000” and insert in place thereof
8 “\$669,000”.

9 (3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
10 Center, District of Columbia, strike out “\$3,557,000”
11 and insert in place thereof “\$4,472,000”.

12 Under the subheading “*FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*
13 *(Second Army Area)*”—with respect to Fort Holabird,
14 Maryland, strike out “\$612,000” and insert in place thereof
15 \$800,000”.

16 Under the subheading “*FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*
17 *(Fourth Army Area)*”—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
18 strike out “\$12,922,000” and insert in place thereof
19 “\$14,283,000”.

20 Under the subheading “*FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*
21 *(Fifth Army Area)*”—

22 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
23 out “\$7,487,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,621,-
24 000”.

(2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,893,000".

(3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "Alaskan Area"—with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$559,000".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$225,277,000", "\$74,984,000", and "\$534,254,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$234,820,000", "\$75,074,000", and "\$543,887,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

1 Under the subheading "*TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
2 *TIES (Ordnance Corps)*"—

3 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
4 York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof
5 "\$136,000".

6 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
7 strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$8,593,000".

9 Under the subheading "*TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
10 *TIES (Quartermaster Corps)*"—

11 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
12 out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000".

13 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
14 Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place
15 thereof "\$1,847,000".

16 Under the subheading "*FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*"—

17 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
18 "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000".

19 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
20 "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

21 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
22 strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof
23 "\$1,373,000".

24 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, “\$200,-
2 783,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$203,331,000”.

3 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
5 tion 402 the amounts “\$86,916,000”, “\$200,783,000”, and
6 “\$323,462,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$95,010,-
7 000”, “\$203,331,000”, and “\$334,104,000”, respectively.

8 TITLE II

9 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
10 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
11 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
12 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
13 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
14 projects:

15 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

16 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

17 Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis,
18 Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

19 Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock
20 \$25,438,000.

21 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
22 \$1,452,000.

23 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
24 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$1,500,000.

1 *Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:*
2 *Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.*

3 *FLEET BASE FACILITIES*

4 *Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,*
5 *\$1,326,000.*

6 *Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront*
7 *facilities, \$544,000.*

8 *Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,*
9 *and utilities, \$2,729,000.*

10 *AVIATION FACILITIES*

11 *(Naval Air Training Stations)*

12 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas:*
13 *Operational facilities, \$566,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational*
15 *facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.*

16 *Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia: Utilities,*
17 *\$293,000.*

18 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-*
19 *tional facilities (Optical landing system), \$160,000.*

20 *Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:*
21 *Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$13,-*
22 *387,000.*

23 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana:*
24 *Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities,*
25 *\$3,653,000.*

1 *Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational*
 2 *facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition,*
 3 *\$2,713,000.*

4 *Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Sausley Field, Florida:*
 5 *Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility),*
 6 *\$39,000.*

7 *(Fleet Support Air Stations)*

8 *Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational*
 9 *facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.*

10 *Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational*
 11 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational*
 13 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,089,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational*
 15 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.*

16 *Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-*
 17 *fornia: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation fa-*
 18 *cility), \$39,000.*

19 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:*
 20 *Operational facilities, \$160,000.*

21 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:*
 22 *Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,310,000.*

23 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-*
 24 *ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.*

1 *Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:*
2 *Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,*
3 *and utilities, \$5,728,000.*

4 *Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational*
5 *facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.*

6 *Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational*
7 *facilities (Optical landing system), \$130,000.*

8 *Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-*
9 *cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$27,535,000.*

10 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-*
11 *tional facilities, \$384,000.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational*
13 *facilities, \$3,401,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational*
15 *facilities (Tactical Air Navigation facility), \$39,000.*

16 *Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:*
17 *Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.*

18 *Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and*
19 *training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground*
20 *improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.*

21 *Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island:*
22 *Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.*

23 *Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,*
24 *California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and*
25 *utilities, \$9,448,000.*

1 *Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington:*
2 *Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.*

3 *(Marine Corps Air Stations)*

4 *Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South*
5 *Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and*
6 *administrative facilities, \$2,632,000.*

7 *Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-*
8 *lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-*
9 *trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground*
10 *improvements, \$6,503,000.*

11 *Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-*
12 *tional facilities, \$3,411,000.*

13 *Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, Cali-*
14 *fornia: Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.*

15 *Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:*
16 *Operational facilities, \$39,000.*

17 *(Special Purpose Air Stations)*

18 *Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsyl-*
19 *vania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.*

20 *Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-*
21 *tional facilities, \$2,209,000.*

22 *Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:*
23 *Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San*
24 *Nicolas Island), \$7,669,000.*

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$6,841,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$872,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, messhall, and utilities, \$1,142,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps School, Quantico, Virginia: Supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,875,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

1 *Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms,*
 2 *California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-*
 3 *istrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,061,000.*

4 *ORDNANCE FACILITIES*

5 *Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utili-*
 6 *ties, \$316,000.*

7 *Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Utilities,*
 8 *\$236,000.*

9 *SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES*

10 *Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory*
 11 *foundations, \$1,602,000.*

12 *Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training*
 13 *facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.*

14 *Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop*
 15 *housing, \$1,613,000.*

16 *COMMUNICATION FACILITIES*

17 *Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-*
 18 *ational facilities, \$443,000.*

19 *Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:*
 20 *Operational facilities, \$100,000.*

21 *Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California:*
 22 *Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.*

23 *Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine:*
 24 *Operational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.*

1 *YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES*

2 *Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,*
3 *\$332,000.*

4 *Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities,*
5 *\$3,244,000.*

6 *Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,*
7 *California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,*
8 *\$759,000.*

9 *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES*

10 *SHIPYARD FACILITIES*

11 *Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of*
12 *Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$1,297,000.*

13 *Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:*
14 *Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and*
15 *community facilities, and utilities, \$1,750,000.*

16 *Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:*
17 *Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and*
18 *ground improvements, \$7,576,000.*

19 *FLEET BASE FACILITIES*

20 *Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-*
21 *munity facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.*

22 *Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-*
23 *bor, Oahu Territory of Hawaii: Administrative facilities and*
24 *utilities, \$332,000.*

1 *Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities,*
2 *\$190,000.*

3 AVIATION FACILITIES

4 Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands:
5 Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities),
6 \$428,000.

7 *Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and*
8 *community facilities, \$1,793,000.*

9 *Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of*
10 *Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),*
11 *\$2,088,000.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-*
13 *lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Opera-*
15 *tional facilities, \$5,730,000.*

16 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
17 tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

18 *Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Opera-*
19 *tional facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.*

20 *Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:*
21 *Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),*
22 *\$69,000.*

23 *Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Op-*
24 *erational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-*
25 *ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.*

1

SUPPLY FACILITIES

2

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,

3

\$1,550,000.

4

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community

5

facilities, \$884,000.

6

Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine

7

Islands: Supply facilities, \$397,000.

8

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

9

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:

10

Utilities, and land acquisition, \$326,000.

11

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

12

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop

13

housing, \$1,053,000.

14

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam,

15

Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

16

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Op-

17

erational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

18

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Opera-

19

tional facilities, \$69,000.

20

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of

21

Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

22

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

23

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Is-

24

lands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

25

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or

1 *develop classified naval installations and facilities by con-*
2 *structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent*
3 *or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site*
4 *preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the*
5 *total amount of \$59,056,000.*

6 *SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-*
7 *gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-*
8 *TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:*

9 *Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-*
10 *TIES", with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,-*
11 *500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".*

12 *(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as*
13 *amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-*
14 *397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".*

15 *(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as*
16 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-*
17 *tion 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000",*
18 *and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place*
19 *thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,-*
20 *927,000".*

21 *SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,*
22 *as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL*
23 *UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:*

24 *Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with*
25 *respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Cali-*

1 *fornia, strike out “\$225,000” and insert in place thereof*
 2 *“\$369,000”; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station,*
 3 *El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in*
 4 *place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the Naval*
 5 *Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and*
 6 *insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.*

7 (b) *Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as*
 8 *amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-*
 9 *358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.*

10 (c) *Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as*
 11 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section*
 12 *502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-*
 13 *807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,-*
 14 *555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.*

15 SEC. 205. (a) *Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,*
 16 *as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL*
 17 *UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:*

18 (1) *Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,*
 19 *with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Cali-*
 20 *fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof*
 21 *“\$1,099,000”.*

22 (2) *Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,*
 23 *with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out*
 24 *“\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.*

25 (3) *Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES*

1 (*Naval Air Training Stations*)", with respect to the Naval
 2 *Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas*, strike out "\$3,686,-
 3 000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with
 4 respect to the *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia,*
 5 *Louisiana*, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place
 6 thereof "\$26,871,000".

7 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
 8 (*Fleet Support Air Stations*)", with respect to the Naval
 9 *Air Station, Alameda, California*, strike out "\$3,729,000"
 10 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
 11 the *Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California*, strike out
 12 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
 13 and with respect to the *Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,*
 14 *Duval County, Florida*, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
 15 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

16 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
 17 (*Special Purpose Air Stations*)", with respect to the Naval
 18 *Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey*, strike out "\$16,311,-
 19 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

20 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
 21 with respect to the *Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,*
 22 *Daingerfield, Texas*, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
 23 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the *Naval*
 24 *Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California*, strike out
 25 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

1 (7) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 2 TIES” with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian
 3 Head, Maryland, strike out “\$780,000” and insert in place
 4 thereof “\$879,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
 7 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

8 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”
 9 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajelein, Marshall
 10 Islands, strike out “\$4,411,000” and insert in place thereof
 11 “\$5,235,000”.

12 (2) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATION FACILI-
 13 TIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
 14 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out “\$2,848,600” and
 15 insert in place thereof “\$3,198,600”.

16 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 17 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 “\$151,-
 18 342,400” and inserting in place thereof “\$152,763,400”.

19 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 21 tion 502 the amounts “\$299,512,600”, “\$107,191,300”,
 22 “\$151,342,400”, and “\$564,046,300” and inserting re-
 23 spectively in place thereof “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”,
 24 “\$152,763,400”, and “\$575,592,300”.

25 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,

1 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
2 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

3 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
4 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-
5 lina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof
6 "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
7 Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in
8 place thereof "\$8,169,000".

9 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
10 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
11 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
12 623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
13 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
14 "\$3,340,000".

15 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
16 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
17 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000"
18 and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

19 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
20 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
21 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
22 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

23 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
24 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-

1 land, strike out “\$7,469,000” and insert in place thereof
2 “\$10,919,000”.

3 (6) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-
4 ITIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
5 San Francisco, California, strike out “\$2,029,000” and in-
6 sert in place thereof “\$3,779,000”.

7 (7) Under the subheading “YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
8 TIES”, with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
9 Virginia, strike out “\$443,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$500,000”.

11 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
12 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED
13 STATES” in section 201, as follows:

14 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”,
15 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
16 out “\$1,961,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,337,000”.

17 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
18 amended by striking out in section 203, “\$84,043,000” and
19 inserting in place thereof “\$85,939,000”.

20 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
21 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
22 amounts “\$292,572,000”, “\$61,625,000”, “\$84,043,000”,
23 and “\$438,240,000” and inserting respectively in place
24 thereof “\$303,453,000”, “\$62,001,000”, “\$85,939,000”,
25 and “\$451,393,000”.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. *The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:*

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North

1 *Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-*
2 *cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community*
3 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.*

4 *Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:*
5 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
6 *supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-*
7 *ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,100,000.*

8 *Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:*
9 *Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utili-*
10 *ties and ground improvements, \$614,000.*

11 *Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:*
12 *Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and*
13 *ground improvements, \$429,000.*

14 *K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:*
15 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
16 *community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
17 *\$905,000.*

18 *Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-*
19 *gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,*
20 *community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
21 *\$1,299,000.*

22 *McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-*
23 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities*
24 *and ground improvements, \$632,000.*

1 *McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply*
2 *facilities and community facilities, \$189,000.*

3 *Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-*
4 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
5 *facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-*
6 *ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-*
7 *ments, \$6,804,000.*

8 *Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New*
9 *York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities*
10 *and ground improvements, \$281,000.*

11 *Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Family*
12 *housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$559,000.*

13 *Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-*
14 *nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,*
15 *troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,-*
16 *828,000.*

17 *Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:*
18 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
19 *supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
20 *\$3,768,000.*

21 *Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:*
22 *Community facilities, \$244,000.*

23 *Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:*
24 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-*
25 *ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.*

1 *Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:*
2 *Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*
3 *utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.*

4 *Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-*
5 *tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.*

6 *Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply*
7 *facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-*
8 *ments, and real estate improvement, \$694,000.*

9 *Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,*
10 *New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utili-*
11 *ties and ground improvements, \$956,000.*

12 *Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Utilities and ground*
13 *improvements and land acquisition, \$130,000.*

14 *Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-*
15 *tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community*
16 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.*

17 *Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-*
18 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
19 *facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improve-*
20 *ments, \$2,153,000.*

21 *Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:*
22 *Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
23 *\$217,000.*

24 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
25 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-*

1 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
2 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
3 sition, \$44,428,000.

4 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

5 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
6 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
7 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
8 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
9 and land acquisition, \$10,410,000.

10 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
11 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

12 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
13 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$899,000.

15 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
16 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
17 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
18 improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,912,000.

19 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
20 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

21 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
24 improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,354,000.

1 *Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:*
 2 *Community facilities, \$56,000.*

3 *Tinker Air Force Base: Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:*
 4 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop*
 5 *housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.*

6 *Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:*
 7 *Operational and training facilities, research, development,*
 8 *and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,*
 9 *utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,*
 10 *\$1,777,000.*

11 *AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND*

12 *Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research*
 13 *development, and test facilities, troop housing, community*
 14 *facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land*
 15 *acquisition, \$5,826,000.*

16 *AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND*

17 *Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-*
 18 *tional and training facilities, research, development, and test*
 19 *facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-*
 20 *provements, \$1,987,000.*

21 *Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:*
 22 *Operational and training facilities, research, development,*
 23 *and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*
 24 *utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.*

1 *Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Ne-*
 2 *vada: Community facilities, \$206,000.*

3 *Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:*
 4 *Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*
 5 *utilities and ground improvements, \$2,276,000.*

6 *Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:*
 7 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
 8 *research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,*
 9 *community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and*
 10 *land acquisition, \$3,469,000.*

11 *Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational*
 12 *and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-*
 13 *ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground*
 14 *improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,882,000.*

15 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

16 *Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational*
 17 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
 18 *ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,*
 19 *and land acquisition, \$2,872,000.*

20 *Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational*
 21 *and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.*

22 *Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-*
 23 *munity facilities, \$262,000.*

24 *Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational*

1 *and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-*
2 *ties, \$2,209,000.*

3 *Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance*
4 *facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and*
5 *ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,848,000.*

6 *Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-*
7 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
8 *facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land*
9 *acquisition, \$8,249,000.*

10 *McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop*
11 *housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-*
12 *ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.*

13 *Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational*
14 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
15 *ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.*

16 *Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community*
17 *facilities, \$436,000.*

18 *Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational*
19 *and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.*

20 *Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-*
21 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities*
22 *and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.*

23 *Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational*
24 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,*
25 *\$5,909,000.*

1 *Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community*
 2 *facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition,*
 3 *and real estate improvements, \$900,000.*

4 *Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-*
 5 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
 6 *facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,*
 7 *\$4,200,000.*

8 *Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,*
 9 *and community facilities, \$1,945,000.*

10 *Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational*
 11 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,*
 12 *\$1,977,000.*

13 *Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational*
 14 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,*
 15 *community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements,*
 16 *\$4,118,000.*

17 *Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-*
 18 *nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,*
 19 *\$865,000.*

20 *AIR UNIVERSITY*

21 *Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land*
 22 *acquisition, \$50,000.*

23 *CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND*

24 *Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical*
 25 *facilities, \$952,000.*

1 *Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-*
 2 *tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.*

3 *Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-*
 4 *ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,*
 5 *\$337,000.*

6 *MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE*

7 *Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,*
 8 *Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.*

9 *Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:*
 10 *Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.*

11 *Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-*
 12 *lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-*
 13 *ments, \$2,216,000.*

14 *Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Troop hous-*
 15 *ing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$745,000.*

16 *McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:*
 17 *Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,*
 18 *and land acquisition, \$496,000.*

19 *STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND*

20 *Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational*
 21 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community*
 22 *facilities, \$848,000.*

23 *Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:*
 24 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*

1 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
2 \$3,344,000.

3 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
5 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,458,000.

6 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
8 facilities, \$1,487,000.

9 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
11 \$5,557,000.

12 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
15 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

16 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
18 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
19 land acquisition, \$8,966,000.

20 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
22 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

23 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
24 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground

1 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
2 ments, \$2,076,000.

3 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$536,000.

6 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
8 facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, and ground
9 improvements, \$2,320,000.

10 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
11 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
12 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,361,000.

13 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
14 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
15 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
16 land acquisition, \$14,638,000.

17 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
18 facilities, \$100,000.

19 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
20 Operational and training facilities and supply facilities,
21 \$1,976,000.

22 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
23 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

24 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
25 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

1 *Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-*
 2 *ties, \$34,000.*

3 *Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:*
 4 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
 5 *supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.*

6 *Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-*
 7 *tenance facilities, \$380,000.*

8 *Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop*
 9 *housing and community facilities, \$994,000.*

10 *Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:*
 11 *Real estate improvements, \$179,000.*

12 *Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:*
 13 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-*
 14 *munity facilities, \$12,552,000.*

15 *Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational*
 16 *and training facilities, \$250,000.*

17 *Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land*
 18 *acquisition, \$37,000.*

19 *Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-*
 20 *ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities*
 21 *and ground improvements, \$1,504,000.*

22 *Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational*
 23 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
 24 *ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.*

1 *MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational*
2 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and*
3 *ground improvements, \$936,000.*

4 *Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:*
5 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and*
6 *utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.*

7 *March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-*
8 *tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.*

9 *Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,*
10 *Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community*
11 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.*

12 *Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational*
13 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
14 *ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground*
15 *improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.*

16 *Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:*
17 *Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
18 *\$231,000.*

19 *Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-*
20 *shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and*
21 *ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.*

22 *Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Community*
23 *facilities, \$372,000.*

24 *Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-*
25 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, com-*

1 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$1,937,000.

3 *Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational*
4 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
5 *ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.*

6 *Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-*
7 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
8 *facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community*
9 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,676,000.*

10 *Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-*
11 *setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-*
12 *munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
13 *\$1,901,000.*

14 *Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-*
15 *ational and training facilities, and community facilities,*
16 *\$235,000.*

17 TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

18 *Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Mainte-*
19 *nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,*
20 *community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and*
21 *land acquisition, \$2,149,000.*

22 *Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Caro-*
23 *lina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and*
24 *community facilities, \$1,287,000.*

25 *England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana:*

1 Troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$1,558,000.

3 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
4 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land ac-
5 quisition, \$683,000.

6 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Sup-
7 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

8 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Utilities
9 and ground improvements, \$20,000.

10 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
11 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
12 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
13 \$1,204,000.

14 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
15 facilities, \$484,000.

16 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
17 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
18 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
19 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
20 sition, and real estate improvements, \$9,991,000.

21 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
22 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

23 SPECIAL FACILITIES

24 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
25 \$229,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$4,742,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$11,500,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$247,000.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,228,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-

1 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$7,569,000.

3 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

4 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
5 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
6 utilities and ground improvements, \$14,741,000.

7 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

8 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities,
9 \$820,000.

10 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
11 training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground
12 improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
15 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
16 \$57,218,000.

17 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

18 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
19 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
20 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
21 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
22 improvements, \$36,057,000.

23 SPECIAL FACILITIES

24 Various locations: Operational and training facilities;
25 \$170,000.

1 *AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM*

2 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
3 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-*
4 *ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-*
5 *munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
6 *\$20,000,000.*

7 *SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish*
8 *or develop classified military installations and facilities by*
9 *acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-*
10 *stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land*
11 *acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and*
12 *equipment in the total amount of \$47,000,000.*

13 *SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,*
14 *as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL*
15 *UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:*

16 *Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with*
17 *respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, Cali-*
18 *fornia, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof*
19 *"\$584,000".*

20 *Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—*
21 *with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Okla-*
22 *homa, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof*
23 *"\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in*
24 *place thereof "\$2,756,000".*

25 *Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-*

1 *MAND*”—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
 2 stead, New York, strike out “\$729,000” and insert in place
 3 thereof “\$929,000”; and strike out “\$686,000” and insert
 4 in place thereof “\$886,000”.

5 Under the subheading “*RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT*
 6 *COMMAND*”—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
 7 Muroc, California, strike out “\$27,478,000” and insert in
 8 place thereof “\$29,442,000”; and strike out “\$16,192,000”
 9 and insert in place thereof “\$18,156,000”.

10 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 11 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
 12 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
 13 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
 14 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

15 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
 16 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “*CONTI-*
 17 *NENTAL UNITED STATES*” in section 301, as follows:

18 Under the subheading “*AIR DEFENSE COMMAND*”—

19 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
 20 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
 21 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

22 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-
 23 kota, strike out “\$7,709,000” and insert in place thereof
 24 “\$9,220,000”;

25 (3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault

1 *Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000 and in-*
2 *sert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";*

3 (4) *with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike*
4 *out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,-*
5 *000";*

6 (5) *with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-*
7 *nard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in*
8 *place thereof "\$2,935,000";*

9 (6) *with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,*
10 *Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and*
11 *insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";*

12 (7) *with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-*
13 *port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and*
14 *insert in place thereof "\$893,000";*

15 (8) *with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,*
16 *Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place*
17 *thereof "\$2,676,000".*

18 *Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—*

19 (1) *with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,*
20 *Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert*
21 *in place thereof "\$4,728,000";*

22 (2) *with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,*
23 *New York, strike out "\$15,803,000" and insert in*
24 *place thereof "\$16,654,000";*

25 (3) *with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,*

1 *Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and*
2 *insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;*

3 *(4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force*
4 *Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and*
5 *insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.*

6 *Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—*

7 *(1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,*
8 *Houston, Texas, strike out “\$3,438,000” and insert*
9 *in place thereof “\$3,876,000”;*

10 *(2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,*
11 *San Angelo, Texas, strike out “\$4,081,000” and insert*
12 *in place thereof “\$5,088,000”;*

13 *(3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,*
14 *Greenville, Mississippi, strike out “\$500,000” and insert*
15 *in place thereof “\$545,000”;*

16 *(4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,*
17 *Harlingen, Texas, strike out “\$446,000” and insert*
18 *in place thereof “\$529,000”;*

19 *(5) with respect to James Connally Air Force*
20 *Base, Waco, Texas, strike out “\$883,000” and insert*
21 *in place thereof “\$1,129,000”;*

22 *(6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,*
23 *Sacramento, California, strike out “\$1,516,000” and*
24 *insert in place thereof “\$1,998,000”;*

25 *(7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-*

1 *bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in*
2 *place thereof "\$1,304,000";*

3 (8) *with respect to Williams Air Force Base,*
4 *Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert*
5 *in place thereof "\$1,556,000".*

6 *Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—*
7 *with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, Dis-*
8 *trict of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place*
9 *thereof "\$825,000".*

10 *Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT*
11 *COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force*
12 *Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada,*
13 *strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,-*
14 *500".*

15 *Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—*
16 (1) *with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort*
17 *Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in*
18 *place thereof "\$7,363,000";*

19 (2) *with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor,*
20 *Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place*
21 *thereof "\$12,218,000";*

22 (3) *with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fair-*
23 *field, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in*
24 *place thereof "\$11,473,000";*

25 (4) *with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-*

1 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
2 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

3 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

4 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
5 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
6 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

7 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
8 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
9 thereof “\$611,000”;

10 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
11 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
12 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

13 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
14 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

16 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
17 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
21 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

22 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—
23 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
24 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

25 Under the subheading “AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL

1 *AIDS*”—with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,-
2 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

3 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
5 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
6 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof
7 “\$824,300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”,
8 respectively.

9 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
10 gress, is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL
11 UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

12 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

13 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
14 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

16 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
17 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
18 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

19 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base,
20 Glasgow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

22 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
23 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
24 and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

25 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,

1 *Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-*
2 *sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;*

3 *(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault*
4 *Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and*
5 *insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;*

6 *(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-*
7 *port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”*
8 *and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;*

9 *(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,*
10 *North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in*
11 *place thereof “\$27,035,000”;*

12 *(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-*
13 *port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”*
14 *and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;*

15 *(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,*
16 *Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-*
17 *sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;*

18 *(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,*
19 *Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert*
20 *in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;*

21 *(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-*
22 *consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place*
23 *thereof “\$8,726,000”;*

24 *(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base,*

1 *Oscoda, Michigan, strike out “\$3,278,000” and insert in*
 2 *place thereof “\$3,808,000”;*

3 *(14) with respect to various locations, strike out*
 4 *“\$21,510,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,201,000”.*

5 *Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—*

6 *(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,*
 7 *New York, strike out “\$17,966,000” and insert in place*
 8 *thereof “\$22,005,000”;*

9 *(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station,*
 10 *Searsport, Maine, strike out “\$473,000” and insert in*
 11 *place thereof “\$745,000”;*

12 *(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station,*
 13 *Tacoma, Washington, strike out “\$129,000” and insert*
 14 *in place thereof “\$251,000”;*

15 *(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Okla-*
 16 *homa City, Oklahoma, strike out “\$5,990,000” and in-*
 17 *sert in place thereof “\$7,763,000”.*

18 *Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—*

19 *(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base,*
 20 *Amarillo, Texas, strike out “\$17,121,000” and insert*
 21 *in place thereof “\$26,471,000”;*

22 *(2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,*
 23 *Alabama, strike out “\$18,000” and insert in place*
 24 *thereof “\$22,000”;*

1 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
2 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out “\$24,433,000” and
3 insert in place thereof “\$33,858,000”;

4 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
5 Nevada, strike out “\$2,221,000” and insert in place
6 thereof “\$3,063,000”;

7 (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid,
8 Oklahoma, strike out “\$977,000” and insert in place
9 thereof “\$1,064,000”.

10 Under the subheading “AIR UNIVERSITY”—with respect
11 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
12 out “\$215,000” and insert in place thereof “\$311,000”.

13 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
14 MAND”—

15 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
16 ville, California, strike out “\$13,395,000” and insert
17 in place thereof “\$15,993,000”;

18 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
19 etta, Georgia, strike out “\$345,000” and insert in place
20 thereof, “\$500,000”.

21 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
22 COMMAND”—

23 (1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field,
24 Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out “\$6,939,000” and
25 insert in place thereof “\$7,530,000”;

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,220,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,190,000";

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,643,000";

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "\$14,518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out "\$943,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,966,000";

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "\$4,952,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,880,000";

(7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,

1 *Great Falls, Montana, strike out “\$1,236,000” and*
 2 *insert in place thereof “\$1,586,000”;*

3 *(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force*
 4 *Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$2,064,000”*
 5 *and insert in place thereof “\$2,607,000”;*

6 *(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,*
 7 *Nebraska, strike out “\$5,697,000” and insert in place*
 8 *thereof “\$6,155,000”;*

9 *(10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,*
 10 *Plattsburgh, New York, strike out “\$1,491,000” and*
 11 *insert in place thereof “\$2,027,000”;*

12 *(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,*
 13 *Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$661,000”*
 14 *and insert in place thereof “\$720,000”;*

15 *(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,*
 16 *Roswell, New Mexico, strike out “\$2,791,000” and*
 17 *insert in place thereof “\$3,181,000”.*

18 *Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—*
 19 *with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia,*
 20 *strike out “\$2,613,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,785,-*
 21 *000”.*

22 *(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is*
 23 *amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED*
 24 *STATES” as follows:*

1 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—
2 with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
5 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
6 amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,-
7 934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000",
8 "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

9 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
10 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
11 read as follows:

12 "(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
13 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
14 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
15 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
16 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
17 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
18 in the next military construction authorization Act would
19 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
20 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
21 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
22 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
23 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
24 Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
25 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the

1 *Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon*
2 *reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-*
3 *struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-*
4 *tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."*

5 *TITLE IV—FAMILY HOUSING*

6 *SEC. 401. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-*
7 *vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the*
8 *Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August*
9 *3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing*
10 *shall be available for the construction of family housing at*
11 *any installations for which family housing is authorized to*
12 *be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.*

13 *SEC. 402. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69*
14 *Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read*
15 *as follows:*

16 *"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and*
17 *1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,*
18 *respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or*
19 *near military tactical installations for assignment as public*
20 *quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,*
21 *without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary*
22 *of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate*
23 *housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-*

1 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
2 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
3 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
4 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
5 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
6 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.”

7 SEC. 403. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
8 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-
9 ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net
10 floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections
11 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

12 (b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68
13 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

14 SEC. 404. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
15 follows:

16 (a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following
17 new subsection at the end thereof:

18 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
19 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
20 the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
21 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

22 (b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following
23 new subsection at the end thereof:

24 “(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters

1 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members
2 of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
3 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

4 (c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following
5 new subsection at the end thereof:

6 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
7 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
8 the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net
9 floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

10 SEC. 405. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
11 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
12 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

13 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
14 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
15 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
16 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
17 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
18 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
19 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
20 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
21 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
22 operation of such housing: Provided, That such payments
23 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
24 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
25 acquisition.”

1 *SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any*
2 *other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family hous-*
3 *ing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support*
4 *of military installations or activities unless the actual num-*
5 *ber of units involved has been specifically authorized by*
6 *an annual military construction authorization act.*

7 *(b) Effective July 1, 1958, the provisions of sec-*
8 *tion 419, Public Law 968, Eighty-fifth Congress, second*
9 *session, are hereby repealed.*

10 *SEC. 407. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any*
11 *other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine*
12 *Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Pub-*
13 *lic Health Service, may occupy on a rental basis, without*
14 *loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate quarters*
15 *under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services, not-*
16 *withstanding that such quarters may have been constructed*
17 *or converted for assignment as public quarters.*

18 *(b) The provisions of this section shall be administered*
19 *under regulations approved by the President.*

20 *(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air*
21 *Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary*
22 *of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is*
23 *operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Sec-*
24 *retary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and*
25 *the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the*

1 *Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the "Sec-*
2 *retaries")*, are each authorized, subject to standards estab-
3 *lished pursuant to (a) above, to designate as rental housing*
4 *such housing as he may determine to be inadequate as public*
5 *quarters.*

6 *(d) The Secretaries are each further authorized, sub-*
7 *ject to standards established pursuant to subsection (a)*
8 *above, to lease inadequate housing to personnel of any of the*
9 *mentioned services for occupancy by them. The housing*
10 *facilities leased, as herein provided, shall not be required*
11 *to have been constructed with funds derived from appro-*
12 *priations specifically made for the purpose of the construc-*
13 *tion of rental housing for personnel of the services mentioned.*

14 *TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS*

15 *SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department*
16 *may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-*
17 *ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and*
18 *3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections*
19 *4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.*
20 *The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-*
21 *ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,*
22 *overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construc-*
23 *tion. That authority may be exercised before title to the*
24 *land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes,*
25 *as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.*

1 *The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-*
2 *thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests*
3 *in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-*
4 *change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.*

5 *SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such*
6 *sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but*
7 *appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles*
8 *I, II, and III shall not exceed—*

9 *(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$114,-*
10 *949,000; outside the United States, \$34,477,000; sec-*
11 *tion 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$292,428,000;*

12 *(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,-*
13 *175,000; outside the United States, \$47,695,000; sec-*
14 *tion 202, \$59,056,000; or a total of \$322,926,000;*
15 *and*

16 *(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$380,-*
17 *354,000; outside the United States, \$160,705,000; sec-*
18 *tion 302, \$47,000,000; or a total of \$588,059,000.*

19 *SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or*
20 *III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-*
21 *cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the*
22 *United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside*
23 *the United States. However, the total cost of all projects*
24 *in each such title may not be more than the total amount*
25 *authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.*

1 *SEC. 504. Whenever—*

2 *(1) the President determines that compliance with*
3 *section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for*
4 *contracts made under this Act for the establishment*
5 *or development of military installations and facilities in*
6 *foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out*
7 *of this Act; and*

8 *(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller*
9 *General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-*
10 *quately auditing those contracts;*

11 *the President may exempt those contracts from the require-*
12 *ments of that section.*

13 *SEC. 505. Contracts made by the United States under*
14 *this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-*
15 *petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the*
16 *national security will not be impaired and the award is con-*
17 *sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code,*
18 *and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,*
19 *551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall*
20 *report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the*
21 *Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to*
22 *all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to*
23 *the lowest responsible bidder.*

24 *SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for*
25 *military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary*

1 of a military department in connection with the establish-
2 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
3 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
4 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and
5 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
6 tion are repealed, except—

7 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
8 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
9 titles that contain the general provisions;

10 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
11 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
12 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
13 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

14 (3) the authorizations for public works and the
15 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
16 2231-2238 of title 10 United States Code, as amended
17 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

18 (4) the authorization for the development of the
19 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
20 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
21 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

22 (5) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
23 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
24 the authorization for (a) development of classified fa-
25 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in

1 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
2 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified
3 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
4 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
5 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

6 (c) the authorization for public works and for the
7 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
8 of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

9 SEC. 507. None of the authority contained in titles I,
10 II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorized any
11 building construction project within the continental United
12 States at an average nationwide unit cost in excess of—

13 (a) \$28 per square foot for cold-storage ware-
14 housing;

15 (b) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

16 (c) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

17 (d) \$7,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters,

18 unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of
19 special circumstances, application to such project of the
20 limitation on unit costs contained in this section is imprac-
21 ticable.

22 SEC. 508. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
23 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out

- 1 *in the first sentence the figure “\$126,000,000” and insert-*
- 2 *ing in place thereof the figure “\$135,425,000”.*

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

JULY 11 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

AUGUST 8 (legislative day, JULY 8), 1957

Reported with an amendment

the best methods of protecting and strengthening the Nation.

As a Senator from the State of Indiana, which cherishes so highly the sovereign independence of our States, I am happy to pay tribute to a Senator who for so many years served the Federal Union of sovereign States which is the keystone of our liberty.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with all of my colleagues who have preceded me today, and also with those who may follow, in what they have said or may say in eulogizing and paying tribute to our deceased friend and former colleague, Walter F. George, of Georgia.

Nothing has been said here today, and nothing will be said, however generous and complimentary, that can possibly be regarded as an exaggeration or extravagance in praise of him whom I admired and esteemed as one of the greatest Americans I have been privileged to know.

I can truly say that my life has been enriched, and the value of my labors here in the Senate has been greatly enhanced, by reason of my knowing him, my association with him, the bond of friendship that existed between us, and his counsel which I so frequently sought and received on many perplexing problems and issues we have had to resolve.

I often sought his advice—particularly so on measures involving taxation and revenues, and on questions relating to foreign affairs. I frequently discussed with him, and sought his opinion on, the overall policies of our Government, for there was no one whose judgment I respected more than his.

He was possessed of great mental capacity, an astute and analytical mind, and a profound wisdom of a quality unexcelled among the statesmen of our time.

He was endowed with those superb and admirable qualities of human kindness, sympathy, understanding, and consideration for his fellowman; and yet he was strong, firm, and unyielding in his convictions. Motivated at all times by the highest ideals and purposes, he pursued his labors, met his responsibilities, and discharged his duties with resolute determination and with fearless and unfaltering courage.

I cannot even begin in these few remarks to enumerate or evaluate the great contribution he made to the welfare of our people, to the security of our country, and of the preservation of human liberty, of freedom, and our American way of life. History will make an accurate appraisal of that, and I am sure it will accord him his proper place among the great of all time.

We know he never sought wealth. He never permitted the material to detract from or obscure the more precious and enduring truths of spiritual values. He was loyal and faithful to friendships and obligations; he was consecrated in his faith and was wholly dedicated to the performance of his duties and to the service and welfare of all mankind.

When the President of the United States said that he felt a keen personal loss when Mr. George passed away, he

spoke truly for millions of American citizens. We here in the Senate too feel, and shall always feel, that we have experienced a keen personal loss now that our friend has gone. But we have this consolation; we know that he left to us an example of sterling character, dynamic integrity, and able and devoted statesmanship worthy of our emulation and a heritage of beautiful memories that we shall always cherish and revere.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS—LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL AND NIAGARA POWER BILL

During the delivery of eulogies on the late Senator George,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit two proposed unanimous-consent agreements, with the understanding that this colloquy and the action thereon will appear at the end of the tributes to the late Senator George.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I submit, in behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, the following two proposed unanimous-consent agreements:

Ordered, That when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction of military installations, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, to which bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The military construction bill, reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I submit another proposed unanimous-consent agreement which is agreeable to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Pennsylvania. I submit it on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8643, the Niagara power bill, debate upon an amendment to be proposed by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. LAUSCHE), on page 2, line 21, or upon any motion or amendment re-

lating thereto, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. CLARK and the majority leader; that upon any other amendment or motion, debate shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any amendment proposed to the bill, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the bill shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided further*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce it may be that the time allowed on both the military-construction bill and the Niagara bill amendments will not be consumed. So all Senators should be on notice that we are going to attempt to get action on both bills before we conclude our deliberations today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the minority leader, I am going to suggest, since committees have work they can do tomorrow and since we both have policy committee meetings, that the Senate convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS ON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow following an adjournment and has the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business only, there be a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 8240.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the time for debate is equally divided and controlled. The time allowed on each amendment is 30 minutes, equally divided, and 1 hour is allowed on the bill, equally divided.

Mr. STENNIS. How is the time divided on the bill and on amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate on the bill is limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, and 30 minutes on each amendment, equally divided between the proponents and opponents.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I allow myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, H. R. 8240 is the annual military construction bill, for military construction projects at home and abroad, classified and unclassified, exclusive of family housing, most of which is called Capehart housing, and also exclusive of Public Law 480, which has to do with agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, when the figures were first submitted by the services to the Department of Defense, the total amount requested for fiscal 1958, in round numbers, was \$3.6 billion. The Department of Defense reduced that total to \$2.09 billion. The Bureau of the Budget first submitted a figure of \$1,779,000,000. Then there was a second request by the Bureau of the Budget—which was the figure submitted when the hearing started—of \$1,561,000,000.

The bill itself recommends \$1,203,000,000, which is a reduction of approximately 34 percent from the amount originally requested.

Mr. President, these reductions were effected largely through the application of certain criteria which were adopted by the Committee in its early deliberations in January and February of this year. Those criteria appear on pages 2 and 3 of the Committee report.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks that part of the report on pages 2 and 3 which is entitled, "Criteria."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 842) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITERIA

In order to insure a review procedure which would meet both the interests of economy and military need, a standard criteria was established in light of which all service requests were compared. In general outline, this criteria is as follows:

1. Items considered firm requirements:

(a) All operational aspects properly justified and for which the services plan to request fiscal year 1958 appropriations.

(b) Replacement of irreparable facilities considered essential to morale and well-being.

(c) Chapels.

(d) Community and recreational facilities and housing at isolated installations, or where local civilian community support does not exist at an adequate level.

(e) Key service school installations for which the services have a long peacetime need.

(f) Deficiency authorizations pertaining to prior-authorized projects resultant from cost-of-living increases, from changes in military technology, and new operational concepts.

2. Items considered feasible to delete or defer:

(a) Officers clubs, noncommissioned officers clubs, commissaries, post exchanges, theaters, and so forth, where adequate facilities already exist, substitute facilities are available, or local civilian community can provide similar support.

(b) Replacement of existing administration buildings, warehouses, and headquarters buildings.

(c) Barracks and bachelor officers quarters where 50 percent of permanent construction program is already provided, or under construction, or where existing World War II assets can continue to be utilized on an economical basis.

(d) Family housing where there exists adequate civilian community support or sufficient prior authorization.

(e) All items not being funded.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, quite briefly with respect to the criteria: The first criterion is that all operational aspects, to be considered firm requirements, are to be properly justified and for them the services plan to request fiscal 1958 appropriations.

I can say to the Senate that in all the reductions recommended there is not one which we believe in any way would impair the bone and muscle of the bill or in any way would impair the essential requirements of the military-construction program for the fiscal year 1958.

We did not include any item in the bill for which the budget did not request authorization. Therefore, any Senator who is interested in any project which has been excluded by the committee, will know that it was not considered by the committee.

Furthermore, we made inquiry with respect to what requests the Department of Defense was going to make along the line of appropriations for the fiscal year 1958. If the Department of Defense reported that it was not going to make any request for an appropriation for a particular project in 1958, we deferred the authorization for that item. That does not mean we rejected it or that we disallowed it; it means that there would be no financing, therefore there was no need for an authorization.

Thus we bring closer into line the authorizations and appropriations. In the past few years we have had many bills which authorized military construction all over the world. Because of changing conditions many of those projects were never built.

Pursuing our trend for another year will bring the situation more into focus, and will serve to bring a closer relationship between authorizations and appropriations, which we think should prevail. Therefore, approximately \$350 million worth of new authorizations have been deferred. They relate mostly to projects which have not been rejected and not

condemned, but merely deferred. There was no request for an appropriation for them. I have a list of those projects, and if any Senator wishes to inquire about them, I can show him the list. Perhaps we can later put the list in the RECORD, for the information of all Senators.

I believe particular attention should be called to one phase of the bill, the one having reference to the Capehart housing. It is contemplated that in the neighborhood of 95,000 units of Capehart housing will be built in fiscal year 1958.

No line authorization is necessary and no appropriation is necessary for those items. At an average of \$15,000 each, they will total, in round numbers, one billion five hundred and twenty million dollars. It shows that for the Capehart housing alone the amount is something like \$300 million more than is provided in the entire military construction bill. For that reason, and for other reasons, we recommend in the bill that the so-called Capehart housing program be discontinued and repealed, and cease to exist as such, after June 30, 1958, that date having been put forward that much to allow a reasonable transition period from one program to another, because the alternative would be that it would be necessary to justify the new housing program and to get an appropriation for it, just as it is necessary to do for other military construction. There must be time in which to transfer from one system to another. It is too late to make appropriations and to justify line items.

The present program for this type of building will run for 1 year. Thereafter it goes back to line authorizations and appropriations, which we believe there will bring about a better program and a better system, will enable the Government to get more for its money, and will assure the persons for whom the houses are built better houses for the money.

The bill provides for 2,640 units at a cost of approximately \$52 million. That is family housing to which, for one reason or another, the Capehart housing law does not apply, perhaps because the housing is located in remote areas or areas of inaccessibility, and because of special circumstances.

The bill contains a rather elaborate provision for substandard housing. It represents the contents of a bill which passed the House in one form and passed the Senate in another form last year. At that time the House and Senate were unable to get together on the program, and the bill did not become law. The bill this year includes the version of the program which passed the Senate last year. In the House the bill is known as the Bennett bill. I hope the differences between the two Houses on this subject can be worked out in conference, because the subject matter, we think, is very timely.

Mr. President, before I am interrupted by questions, I wish especially to thank, and to commend as well, my colleagues on the subcommittee which considered the bill—the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The bill contains about 4,000 lines of items and represents days and days of hearings, in

addition to a large amount of field-work. The two Senators I have named are experts on the matter in many ways. They worked very diligently, most happily, most cooperatively, and very effectively. They have done as much work on the bill as I have, if not more. They deserve more credit than I do for what has been done. On behalf of the subcommittee and on behalf of the Senate, I thank them. It has been a great treat for me to work with them.

In a large measure, the subcommittee has been guided in the writing of the bill by the able and timely assistance of our staff member, Col. Kenneth BeLieu, who has rendered outstanding service and has helped to prepare a report which I think is really outstanding and should be in the files of every Senator and every Senator's staff. That report contains a world of up-to-date information on the entire building program, and a great number of suggestions, as well.

The bill contains a provision for \$115 million as an installment on what is called the Nike program. That is the air-to-ground missile defense.

Mr. President, in that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD pages 21 and 22 and half of page 23 of the report—No. 842—under the the subject Continental Air Defense.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINENTAL AIR DEFENSE

During the course of this and last years' hearings on the military construction authorization bills, it has become increasingly apparent to the committee that more and more of our military resources are being directed to the field of continental air defense. Last year, the committee said:

"While it is not the committee's intent to delve into the broad fields of military strategy or policy, the very act of authorizing military construction and base structure facilities is in itself a policymaking function, particularly when it deals with the foundations for weapons systems and the bases from which operations will be conducted. As mentioned before, DEW line is a billion-dollar project and so is SAGE. The Nike-Talos systems is a multi-billion-dollar program. These things are basically for defensive purposes. In reviewing the requirements contained in this bill for facilities and systems to provide passive defense, the committee has had occasion to question whether there might be a dangerous trend toward a 'Maginot line' type of thinking, and with the construction and establishment of fixed defense installations, whether the military posture of the Nation might as a result be limited in offensive capabilities."

The committee is still of the same frame of mind. It believes the time has come to reevaluate and to insure that our efforts are spent only on those systems that will meet future requirements. The committee believes that close and continuous scrutiny must be given the subject in order that too great a priority is not given to defensive aspects, even to the extent of denying funds and authorizations and of cutting back existing programs in favor of those which promise greater results. Obviously, until we have an offensive weapon system which will completely deter an aggressor, we must maintain adequate defenses. An adequate defense system, however, must be designed to keep pace in a flexible manner with any threat against the United States. In view of the

ever-increasing capacity of offensive weapons, both in our hands and in those of the potential aggressor, the committee cannot help but feel uncomfortable at the thought of spending increased amounts for the weapons which represent but a last-ditch symbol. Defensive operations, in the opinion of the committee, should not be hampered by an absence of initiative which the committee believes is inherent in fixed positions. One has only to remember what happened to the "Maginot line" concept to be well aware of this point.

Approximately 40 percent of this year's Army-construction program is devoted to Nike. Nike is a fixed-point defensive system. It will be remembered that when the Korean war broke out, it was decided to deploy anti-aircraft units in defense of key installations in the United States. At first, conventional gun battalions were used. Then as the Nike was developed, the gun battalions were more and more replaced by Nike battalions. The committee believes the original Nike system was properly conceived to meet a need existing at that time, that it fills a requirement as of now; however, the committee questions the wisdom of future extensions of the system on a larger scale. In view of the fact that weapons of mass destruction can be released at great distances from their potential targets, the committee came to the conclusion that the time is at hand when emphasis must be placed on weapons systems which will provide greater defense in depth.

The committee also became quite concerned over the possibility that the Department of the Army might be placing too much emphasis and devoting too much of its effort to static-defense concepts. It feels that the Army must place first priority on the capability to engage in successful and sustained ground combat—that this mission must not be subordinated to any other.

In view of the foregoing, the committee seriously considered recommending that no further authorization be approved to expand the existing Nike system. It does not so recommend only because the best military advice available strongly recommended that the committee approve the program. The committee thoroughly reviewed the subject. It was made the topic of a special classified briefing conducted by a representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and senior departmental witnesses. Results of this briefing were such as to convince the committee that even though it still has doubts, it has no other recourse than to recommend the Nike funds be authorized in this year's construction program.

Even though the committee was impressed by the aforementioned briefing, it could not help but conclude that in many areas each military service is developing weapons systems in a seeming effort to become self-sufficient apparently with little regard to those in existence or being developed by other services. The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to take vigorous action to insure that only those systems are approved and maintained that fit in with the overall strategic doctrine (and at this point, it cannot help but state that it hopes this doctrine will be tailored to tactical and strategic requirements rather than budgetary decisions). The committee feels that it is pertinent at this time to quote from Henry A. Kissinger's article in the Foreign Affairs magazine of April 1957, entitled "Strategy and Organization":

"In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, our actions will of necessity prove haphazard; conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. Each problem, as it arises, will seem novel and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Our services will find it impossible to make a meaningful choice

among the mass of new weapons with which their research and development programs will soon overwhelm them. We will continue to cede the initiative to others and our course will become increasingly defensive."

The requirements for each new weapon or system when presented to the committee have been justified mainly on the ground of technological advances and military capabilities. This is only natural and proper but it is also only logical to expect certain older and superseded systems to be discarded. Earlier this year, the Chief of Naval Operations in an appearance before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, stated in part, "we are converting cruisers to missile ships—and we are building guided missile destroyers—because guns are no longer effective against modern aircraft. We are converting to a guided missile capability as fast as we can." The committee cannot help but question the retention and maintenance of conventional anti-aircraft artillery units in the troop structure. At this very moment the committee is in receipt of requests to approve leasing arrangements in order that conventional AAA gun battalions may continue to be deployed in defense of key installations. It surely would appear that if further troop reductions are to be made, they should be made in this area.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense must not only closely scrutinize the extent to which our limited military resources are allocated to air defense, including area and point missile systems and manned interceptors, but must also take positive steps to eliminate ineffective weapon systems.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article by Hanson W. Baldwin entitled "New Missile Program Is Left Up to McElroy." I ask unanimous consent that the article on this great problem be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW MISSILE PROGRAM IS LEFT UP TO McELROY—CHOICE OF WEAPONS AND ASSIGNMENT TO SERVICES YET TO BE DECIDED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Secretary Charles E. Wilson, who entered office in 1953 as an economizer, is leaving with a trail of canceled projects and many noses out of joint behind him.

The ax, so far, has bitten rather deeply into the Nation's tremendous missile program. The Air Force's supersonic ram-jet winged missile Navaho, designed for a 5,000-mile range, has been canceled after half to three-quarters of a billion dollars had been spent on it.

The Navaho is perhaps the most spectacular cutback in the missile program, but many others, unannounced, are probably impending. The Navy's Triton project—like the Navaho, powered by large ram-jet engines—may be eliminated; and there appear to be a number of other projects facing cutbacks or stretchouts.

These economies may sharpen a good many unsettled or partially settled conflicts between the services which Mr. Wilson leaves as a heritage to his successor, Neil H. McElroy.

KEY DECISIONS

In one of the key decisions of his term of office Mr. Wilson last fall adjudicated a missiles dispute which was primarily between the Army and Air Force. The Air Force's Thor (developed by Douglas Aircraft and a complex of companies) was in competition with the Army's Jupiter (developed by the Army's ballistic missile agency at Redstone Arsenal, Ala.). Both missiles were

designed for intermediate, or 1,500-mile, range; both services hoped to use them.

Mr. Wilson ruled that parallel development of the two missiles was to continue until late this fall when they would be evaluated and one or the other selected for final development and production. But at the same time he held that the IRBM (intermediate-range ballistic missile), like the ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile), would be, when finished, operated by the Air Force, not the Army. He ruled that the Army should not plan to operate anything beyond the 200-mile Redstone missile, now coming into service. At the same time he assigned point antiaircraft defense to the Army; it was to operate all antiaircraft missiles up to the 100-mile range; the Air Force, with responsibility for antiaircraft area defense, would take over, beyond that range, with its 200-mile Bomarc missile.

NAVY'S MISSILES

The Navy was not directly affected by these judgments since its requirements for ship-based missiles differ technically from those that are land based. The Navy was authorized to continue development of its antiaircraft weapons and its ship-based version of the 1,500-mile IRBM—the Polaris.

The Army—particularly its junior ranks—was greatly cast down last fall by Mr. Wilson's decision. But this decision did not by any means shut the door completely to the Army's development of long-range bombardment and antiaircraft missiles and to the Army's hopes of gaining operational control of some of these missiles in the future. In fact, Mr. Wilson's decision permitted competitive development and testing of Jupiter and Thor and permitted the Army to develop in "limited feasibility studies" experimental versions of bombardment missiles which would fill the gap between Redstone's 200-mile reach and Jupiter and Thor's 1,500-mile range.

Today, as the time of decision again approaches, the Army—which some of its officers thought was underdog last year—seems to be in a rather good position. The Army's Jupiter has been successfully launched several times, and it has flown more than 1,500 miles. Thor, on the other hand, has had several abortive launchings, and one very short flight, interrupted by a malfunction.

The Army has also developed—in addition to a whole host of short-range tactical missiles—new bombardment missiles of great promise. It has developed or tested about six different configurations of ballistic missiles with ranges between 200 and 1,500 miles—a gap hitherto unfilled. These are by no means ready for production but could serve as prototypes.

The Sergeant, a bombardment missile with a range between the Corporal's 90 miles and the Redstone's 200, is another Army missile with challenging potential. Unlike the other longer ranged missiles, the Sergeant uses solid propellants, and further development of its rocket motor could put it into competition with the Navy's solid-propellant Polaris.

ARMY PROJECT

The Army also has in an early production, final development stage the improved Nike-Hercules, with 50- to 60-mile range, and nuclear warhead. And it is continuing experimental initial development work on a system to combat ballistic missiles.

This work got a great technical boost last week when a technological breakthrough was achieved which will, in time, lead to the development of so-called long-range radar capable of detecting ballistic missiles in their upper trajectories thousands of miles away.

Thus actual events between last fall and today have demonstrated Mr. Wilson's wisdom in leaving something of an open door for competitive missile development. If

Jupiter had been halted and all our bets placed on the Thor, the Nation might not be anywhere near as close to an operational IRBM as it is today. This need for competitive and parallel roles in research and development has been proved time and again in the past: the air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines, for example. To this extent service rivalries pay off and competition is not only healthy but essential.

But when development reaches its final stages, someone must intervene to prevent unnecessary duplication and make a choice of 1 or both of 2 competitive systems. And at the same time top authority must decide what service is to handle and operate the weapon that is finally developed.

These problems, despite the precedent set by Mr. Wilson's order of last year, have not been finally resolved. Mr. McElroy will have to take them on this broad shoulders early in his tenure of office.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the information contained in the report on that subject is very helpful. It includes a quotation from our last year's observation and recommendations.

I speak for myself with reference to that part of the program without elaboration. But I feel we are spending too much money and placing too much emphasis on mere point defense. We are trying to defend many individual points in the United States by means of a program which is fast approaching a cost of many billions of dollars. If it is carried to its ultimate purpose, the cost will be many more billions of dollars.

Trying to defend every important point throughout the country—and the points are important—involves a tremendous cost for the installation of a missile which was brilliantly conceived. But I believe the time has passed when the kind of attack which will come can be successfully coped with. After a modern air attack of any kind has reached to within 25 or 50 miles of any city in the United States, the attacker is already here. Anyway, some of his planes most probably would get through. In modern times, only one weapon need get through in order to destroy.

There would be great merit in the system if it were proposed that we could defend everything throughout the country to the ultimate degree. But I myself think that we are making a great mistake in spending multibillions of dollars for a system which is purely defensive. We ought to put our money into and of offensive striking power, obtain the very best type of warning system which can be had, and then install perimeter defenses.

But, after all, we are not the ones who make the final decision. I hope that the missiles, important as they are—and they are important—will be further evaluated, and that better and more specific recommendations will be made concerning the programs, with greater emphasis in the years to come on the offense rather than on the point defense.

As the report states, we were reluctant to abolish a system which is recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nevertheless, speaking for myself, I am becoming a little tired of hearing so much conflicting testimony about these matters from our own military men.

I hope the program soon will be advanced to the stage where there will be

more uniformity of opinion about its merits, and that the so-called big money will be put more into offense rather than into point defense.

The bill does not provide for the so-called John Towers Field, which was proposed for the Naval Academy. The committee strongly recommends that room be found for the cadets at the Naval Academy. We want the cadets to have the necessary briefing, orientation, and implementation concerning air operations, but we feel, since Annapolis is so near the Andrews Air Force Base, where the Air Force has a tremendous installation, with an immensity of space, that it is not practical to have the Government buy new land in order to make an entirely new installation.

Pages 25 to 37 of the report contain a very valuable tabulation of the different items in the bill, according to the services.

On pages 41 to 47 there is a tabulation according to States.

On pages 47 and 48 there is a tabulation according to areas outside the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 15 minutes which the Senator from Mississippi allotted to himself have expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not speak at great length, but in order to provide myself with some time, I offer an amendment, which I shall later ask to withdraw.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 95, line 5, it is proposed to delete "\$59,056,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$58,027,000."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have offered the amendment as a means of affording myself additional time. I allot myself 10 minutes on the amendment.

I call attention to the competitive bidding on construction of military housing. In the last year, 93 percent of the money spent was on competitive bids. The other 7 percent has been spent on non-competitive construction, due to isolation or some other special circumstances which controlled.

Section 507 carries something which the Senate inaugurated several years ago, in placing a ceiling on the unit costs of these installations. For warehouses, we continue the ceiling of \$6 a square foot, average. But for cold-storage warehouses we increased the unit cost of \$22 a square foot to a possible \$28 a square foot.

For barracks, the ceiling is \$1,850 per man, and we continue it at \$1,850.

For bachelor officers' quarters, the present ceiling is \$6,500 per unit. We have increased that, on proof of what almost seemed to be necessity, to \$7,500 per unit.

Mr. President, I believe that covers the high points of the bill. I certainly wish to have ample time used by other members of the subcommittee, and I shall be glad to yield to them.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to

express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee and to my colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and to our staff assistant, Colonel BeLieu, for an outstanding job.

I think it can be said that we have made some prudent economies. I believe it can be said that we have accomplished these economies without reducing our military capabilities. I believe these are the kinds of economies that are most appropriate under the circumstances.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in the presentation of this authorization bill to the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington very much. I also thank him again for his very valuable services on the subcommittee and his very fine knowledge of many phases of this immense, worldwide program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the bill, if I may.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota 20 minutes, or whatever amount of time he may care to have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps I shall need 15 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from California wishes to ask a question. In that case, I yield first to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Actually, I should like to ask two questions.

First of all, let me say that I was most interested in the Senator's comment regarding the military-construction program for housing. Judging from some of the housing which has been constructed in the past few years, particularly in Europe, for military personnel, and judging particularly from the Air Force housing which has been constructed, it seems to me that Uncle Sam does not have the most desirable type of construction which I personally witnessed in the case of some of the housing which has been built there in connection with some of our Air Force installations.

On that point, can the Senator from Mississippi tell me whether the Capehart housing program will continue in operation until June 30, 1958, subject to having Congress carry out the recommendations which the Senator from Mississippi and the other members of the subcommittee have made in their report?

Mr. STENNIS. The bill, as we have reported it to the Senate, provides that the Capehart program may continue until June 30, 1958; thereafter, the so-called program of line items and appropriated funds will take over. But there will be no interim period or break.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the Capehart housing program will have to die on June 30, 1958; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; but by that time the other program will have been reinstated.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

I have another problem in mind: Of course, in the Western States, water is of paramount importance. I come from a semiarid State—California—which has a continuing water problem.

I should like to ask this question: When a military installation is located in a semiarid area, and when the local people—for example, the farmers—have organized reclamation districts or irrigation districts, in order to bring water to their lands, in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, what is the policy which the military establishes in connection with participating in any costs with respect to the program in an area where a military installation is located and needs supplemental water? Is there a policy in that connection?

Mr. STENNIS. It is purely a local problem, depending upon the circumstances existing there. Usually the military meets the situation. In our construction program, we do not have any method of dealing directly with problems of that kind. The procedure in such a case is just like the procedure in connection with foundation problems and similar problems: They have to cope with what they find, and to deal with it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it fair to conclude that so far as the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps are concerned, to the extent they would benefit from having supplemental water brought into an area where such an installation is located, to that extent that branch of the service would have authority to enter into agreements in that connection?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. It is a local matter, and they participate in working it out as best they can.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not wish to keep the floor, to the exclusion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am glad to wait.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. I believe the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] had previously indicated that he wished to ask a question. At this time I shall yield to him, if the Senator from Ohio does not mind waiting.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to wait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from South Dakota for their courtesy.

Does the Senator from Mississippi believe that the Nike installations are obsolete?

Mr. STENNIS. If there were to be an attack on a city or military installation in the United States, it would come with weapons with which, in my opinion, Nike, unfortunately, could not completely cope or deal effectively. But there is a great difference of opinion on that point. Some military men say it could not; some say it could. But I do not think we should go so deep on that program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that approximately \$3 billion has already been spent on this program, and that billions more are scheduled to be spent on it.

Mr. STENNIS. I have understood that the actual figures on that matter were classified. Frankly, I could not see any reason why they should be classified. But the Senator's information is about the same as mine. It is in the neighborhood of several billion dollars, with many more anticipated, in my estimation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the Senator from Mississippi agree that if the Army has been doing as much fine work in the ground-to-ground missile field as we have been hearing about recently, in the IRBM field—then, instead of making an arbitrary limitation—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes the Senator from Mississippi has yielded to himself have expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I continue to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator.

Does not the Senator from Mississippi agree that it would be better to continue the program in question—the IRBM program on the part of the Army—than concentrating on what the Senator from Mississippi has so ably described in his analysis of point defense?

Mr. STENNIS. That is my opinion, after hearing all the testimony, backward and forward, for approximately 2 years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Mississippi to state that he would place in the RECORD at this point the part of his committee's report dealing with the intercontinental air defense?

Mr. STENNIS. I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks excerpts from the report dealing with this very important subject.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi for the splendid job which he, as chairman, and the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] have done in reporting the bill to the Senate. They have been very thorough. Especially now that so much emphasis is being placed on the importance of additional economy, I believe the position they have taken on the bill reported is sound and wise.

Mr. President, I hope that the amount of these reductions will be taken into full consideration—reductions in our own forces and in needed construction for our forces—when the foreign-aid bill comes before the Senate.

I thank the able Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Referring to page 3 of the report, under the title, "Department of Defense Actions," in about the third sentence, I read:

Originally, the total service requests for new authorization amounted to \$3,641 million.

Those were the requests submitted to the Secretary of Defense by the various agencies; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Reading further, it states:

At the Secretary of Defense level, this total was reduced to \$2,098 million.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the first figure the Department of Defense settled on.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is the further statement that:

Following this, further reductions were made, presumably by the Bureau of the Budget, until the final official figure submitted to Congress was approximately \$1,779,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is my understanding correct that the amount finally recommended by the Senate committee was \$1,203,413,000, as shown on page 2, covering new installations?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But, in addition to that, in order to have a complete picture of the total expenditures for installations, one would have to add another figure, which appears on what page?

Mr. STENNIS. On pages 39 and 40.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the bottom of page 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. I allow myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the total amount which will be appropriated covering new installations and supplemental allocations to complete projects previously authorized and started?

Mr. STENNIS. The appropriation bill is now before the Appropriations Committee and carries a total request of \$1,665,000,000. It includes all the items in the pending bill, plus old authorizations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean the original request of \$3,641,000,000 has been brought down, through screening in the various phases of its consideration, to the sum of \$1,600,000,000—

Mr. STENNIS. No. The original request for new authorizations, new authorized projects, new items, has been brought down to \$1,200,000,000, as reflected in this bill; but in the appropriation bill we not only have authorizations which we call new, but we have older authorizations from prior years, under which requests were made for money. Sometimes they involve a second installment or a third installment on a project.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the overall amount requested to implement the old authorization?

Mr. STENNIS. It is the difference between \$1.6 billion and \$1.2 billion; in round figures, about \$400 million. Actually it is between \$400 million and \$440 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the Senator from South Dakota that he has 15 minutes of his own on the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to myself, if I may, 3 minutes on the amendment, merely to deal with the question which the Senator from Ohio has raised.

I think the comparative figures which the Senator wants are those dealing with new authorizations. The Senator was correct, in his reference to page 3, that the total request for new authorizations was \$3,641,000,000, and that figure should be compared with the \$1,203,000,000 figure, as the authorizations here reported as new authorizations. However, there is, as has been indicated by the chairman, an augmentation of prior authorizations of approximately \$181 million, and that brings the authorizations as carried in the bill to a total of about \$1,445,000,000.

That, technically, is the authorization carried in the bill. Of that figure, \$181 million is an augmentation of prior authorizations because of a change in plans, change in cost of construction, or something of that sort. The figure which the Senator from Ohio has most recently asked about—that is, the appropriation figure—the Senator from Mississippi has suggested is approximately \$1,700 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. \$1,665 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That figure is a figure known to the Appropriations Committee, but it is not necessarily carried in the bill. It deals with cash for prior authorizations in prior years. When I come to my general remarks, I expect to deal with some of those prior authorizations to some extent.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I believe I have used all my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield the Senator 3 more minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I notice the committee has stricken out the authorization for the Fort Jackson Hospital.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The Senator is correct. That came about in this way. It was not a rejection or a disapproval of the item, but it was not recommended by the Budget Bureau, and there was no request for an appropriation for the fiscal year 1958. Really, the Army advised that it was not going to spend any remainder of the money on that project, so

the item went out of the bill as the rest of such items do, under the rule not to authorize this year items for which no appropriation is to be requested or for which no money is to be spent. It is a deferral rather than a disapproval.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Was the committee's attention called to the need for 500 beds?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. It was not in the budget recommendation of last year, but the committee recommended it to the Senate, and the Senate approved the item. Also, there was not any budget request for an appropriation last year, but an appropriation for it was approved. On the list of priorities, the Army said it was not going to build or spend any money on it, so there was not anything to do but take the item out of the bill. However, the authorization still stands and the authorization for a 500-bed hospital stands. The request was to authorize a 1,000-bed hospital. The committee did not disapprove it, but deferred it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator this question: The bill refers to it as Camp Jackson. It is Fort Jackson. There is quite a difference between a camp and a fort. Fort Jackson is permanent. Can the Senator explain why it is designated in that manner?

Mr. STENNIS. We have understood it to be Fort Jackson. I suppose the old term was simply carried forward through error. We have a memorandum from the Army, dated in May 1957, in which it is referred to as Fort Jackson.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly hope that is true. When it is named "Fort Jackson" the name refers to a permanent fort. Of course, a camp is sometimes temporary.

Mr. STENNIS. We gave every consideration to the matter. That particular item went out on the grounds I have stated.

May I now yield to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The three minutes yielded to the Senator have expired. Does the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] desire to yield any additional time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, out of the time in opposition to the amendment I yield an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who was so instrumental in helping Fort Jackson obtain its authorization, in 1955, for the new hospital at Fort Jackson. Fort Jackson is a permanent military installation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. It had been permanent for many years, until about 1949, when President Truman took it off the list. It was restored to the permanent list in 1956. Since it is a permanent installation a need is felt for permanent buildings. According to my information, the Army feels that one of its most important needs is a permanent hospital. In 1955, as I stated, the authorization and

appropriation of \$5 million was passed, for the purpose of building a permanent hospital at Fort Jackson. At that time the construction was calculated upon the basis of a 250-bed hospital on a 500-bed chassis. Since that time, as I am informed, one reason why no steps have been taken to go forward with the hospital is that the Defense Department and the Army feel they do not wish to proceed with plans for construction of a hospital which they believe will be inadequate, and that they really need a larger hospital. They desire a 500-bed hospital on a 1000-bed chassis. That will provide for the hospital to be expanded in the future.

I can readily see the advantage in such a hospital, and can understand the position of the Defense Department and the Army in this matter, because the larger hospital will be needed.

There is just one question I should like to ask the Senator. I observe that in the House bill—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes which were yielded to the Senator have expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield an additional 1 minute from the time in opposition.

Mr. THURMOND. The five and four-tenth million dollars were put in the bill to increase the hospital to the size which is actually desired. Since the subcommittee on the Senate side left that item out this year, I should like to ask the Senator to bear that matter in mind when the bill goes to conference. The need for this hospital is urgent. We hope that the conferees will see fit in the conference committee to give most careful consideration to the matter of restoring the authorization which was put in by the House.

Mr. STENNIS. I can assure the Senator it will certainly be considered in the conference. I know of the Senator's fine interest in and diligent and consistent work on this matter for 2 years now. It has come a long way in that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from South Dakota desire?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes of the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of the time on the bill, or on the amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Ten minutes of the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 minutes remaining on the amendment and 30 minutes on the bill. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes from his time on the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the impact of this annual military construction bill on the military posture of the United States is not generally recognized, but by this bill, its predecessors and successors, we gradually determine the shape and form of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Does the Army desire a large tract of the national forest for a firing range?

The authorization basically will come out of the military construction bill.

Does the Navy desire a large portion of the public domain for a flying training area suited to its needs? The answer will come out of the authorization carried in this annual bill.

Does the Air Force feel it has a need for an expansion of its military bases overseas? The basic authorizations are to be found in this bill, in its predecessors, or in the successor bills to it.

Therefore, Mr. President, the military-construction bill, whether the members of the Armed Services Committee or the members of the particular subcommittee desire it so or not, does set the pattern. The fact remains that we are compelled to make decisions which determine the military posture of the United States.

At the outset of my remarks, I should like to join in the tribute which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], my colleague on the subcommittee, has paid to the chairman of the subcommittee for his splendid work in the long hearings which were conducted. The size of the hearings in printed form as to this particular bill, although they carry some 790 pages, do not suggest the length of the hearings which the committee conducted. By the very nature of things, a great deal of the testimony taken was off the record. It was classified and of a nature which could not be printed. The committee keeps a record of its action in all respects, and the record is preserved for the reference of the committee or those who might need it in years to come.

We do conduct many long hearings. The chairman of the subcommittee was not only efficient, but patient with the members of the subcommittee as to their desire to explore certain aspects of the problems presented.

All I say about the chairman could also be stated as my feelings toward my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], because he has made a most valuable contribution to the deliberations of the subcommittee, by his repeated insistence upon facing the problem that is represented in the development of missiles in our several military branches at this time. The junior Senator from Washington serves not merely on our subcommittee but also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and there has access to and has a personal knowledge of the developments in the nuclear field. His experience has been most valuable to the subcommittee, and I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the obligation which I think the Senator from Mississippi and I both feel for him in that regard.

I also wish to say that I think the report which the committee has presented is the finest report which has ever been presented from the military construction subcommittee during the period I have been a member of it, which now covers some 4 years.

Colonel BeLieu has not merely been an aid to the committee in digging up information, but in his organization of the material for the consideration of the committee he has saved us all a great deal of time. The keen analytical ability

he has with respect to military problems is reflected in the organization of and in the text of the report which is submitted. I feel personally a deep obligation to him for that, and I think the country should know he has made that contribution.

While I am saying something about the personnel, Mr. President, I should like to say that Mr. Floyd S. Bryant, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, and his assistant, Mr. Ed Sheridan, have been of great assistance to the committee. I could go on and mention the assistants of the several representatives of the Air Force, Army, and the Navy, but I shall not take the time to do that. I do, however, wish to say that when Mr. Franklin G. Floete, the present Administrator of the General Services Administration, left the post of Assistant Secretary of Defense—Properties and Installations—all of us felt that we were losing a man who would be practically irreplaceable. However, Mr. Bryant, his successor, and Mr. Sheridan, Assistant to the Secretary, have been most helpful and have certainly demonstrated that they were well qualified for the trust which is imposed upon them in the important positions they hold, in coordinating the military-construction programs of the three services for the Defense Department.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I notice, on page 70 of the bill, that the committee has stricken section 411, which continues through most of page 71. That refers specifically to what must be done by the Defense Departments before they can close any establishment which might be considered as a business activity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Section 411, as carried in the bill passed by the House, is not included in the Senate version of the bill as our committee has reported it.

Mr. THYE. I wish to commend the committee for having stricken this proposed language from the bill, because if this language were to remain in the bill, as I understand, it would deny any of the Defense Department agencies the opportunity to close out any of their activities which might be classified as strictly business activities, which might better be carried on by private enterprise, rather than by any agency of the Defense Department.

I commend the committee for having stricken this section from the bill. I hope the committee will resist any effort to reinstate this language in the bill, if an attempt should be made to do so, and I express the hope and strong conviction that in conference, if the House Members should insist upon their version of the bill the Senate conferees will resist reinstatement of this language, because the Select Committee on Small Business conducted many hearings throughout the year, extending into the spring, on this very question. The Defense Department has made an effort to dispose of its business activities wherever they are in competition with private enterprise; and if language like this remains in the bill, we tie the hands of the De-

fense Department, and continue defense agencies in the field of private enterprise. So I commend the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure I speak for the other members of the committee when I say that we are pleased to hear the words which the Senator from Minnesota has spoken with respect to section 411. I think I can say that our action was unanimous in reporting the bill to the Senate without section 411 of the House version. So far as I am personally concerned, I would resist its reinstatement on the floor, as I would resist its reinstatement in the conference.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

I hold in my hand a committee report dealing specifically with that question. The heading of the report is "Government Competition With Private Business." The report is dated April 16, 1957. We conducted hearings to try to establish where the Federal Government was in competition with private business.

Mr. CASE. It was not my intent to speak particularly on that section, or to go into detail. However, in view of what the Senator has said, I may say that there are two considerations—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

With respect to what the Senator from Minnesota has said, let me say that there are two reasons why I think we would oppose the reinstatement of this language.

The first is that which the Senator has stated. We feel that if the Defense Department wants to get out of competition with private business it should be permitted to do so.

Second, we think it should be permitted to do so without having to come to congressional committees and submit to us, on a referendum basis, the question as to whether or not the business should be continued, if it employs 10 persons or more in competition with private business. The Armed Services Committee has several responsibilities, and we do not think we should have the detailed responsibility of making a determination in such cases as that.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator for giving us that positive statement and assurance that the committee will continue to resist any effort to reinstate that language.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I urge on the conferees—if there is to be a conference—that they look thoroughly into the question of the additional 500 hospital beds at Fort Jackson.

It may be that I am somewhat influenced by sentiment. I helped to survey the first spur track which ran from the Southern Railroad to Fort Jackson. Also I helped to survey for the first barracks there. I was in the Army at the time. Also I helped to lay out the first streets at Fort Jackson. I have kept up with it down to the present day.

Since Fort Jackson is a permanent installation, the additional 500 beds in

the hospital would mean much, not only to Fort Jackson, but to a great many people in the immediate vicinity. There should be a sufficient number of beds to take care of the people of the vicinity.

I remember that in 1949 the War Department issued a standby order with regard to Fort Jackson. I remember that on many occasions I took up the subject with the War Department, and conferred with my friend Louis Johnson. Finally, I think because I talked so much about Fort Jackson, because of sentiment, he continued the fort at Fort Jackson. If Senators will look up the record, they will find many telegrams which passed between Louis Johnson and myself. At that time I think probably I helped to save Fort Jackson; and today I wish to try to help save the hospital, and get the 500 beds, if possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina had a great deal to do not only with starting Fort Jackson, but with saving it, as he says. He is a persuasive Senator, and I am sure the other members of the subcommittee will join with me in saying that we gave careful consideration to the proposal to increase the authorization for hospital beds at Fort Jackson.

However, unfortunately, once in a while committees must make decisions which will permit them to be consistent all along the line.

The Senator from South Carolina very properly reflects his sentiments with regard to matters affecting his State; but it would have been impossible for the subcommittee to have permitted its affection for the Senator from South Carolina and its desire to respect his sentiments to influence its decision without making it impossible for the subcommittee to draw the line with respect to other special requests. The augmentation of the hospital organization at Fort Jackson was impossible under the very first of the criteria which were established. The chairman of the subcommittee has inserted them in the Record, and I shall not take the time to repeat more than the very first one:

1. Items considered firm requirements:

(a) All operational aspects properly justified and for which the services plan to request fiscal year 1958 appropriations.

We were advised that the services would not ask for 1958 appropriations for the implementation of any augmentation of the hospital at Fort Jackson. Consequently, we could not, with the criterion applying to other requests, include the augmentation in the bill we reported. However, I am sure that the subcommittee will give careful consideration to any matter which may come up in conference.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to the housing program which is presented by the bill, and then I wish to devote a few observations to the overall aspects of the bill.

The military housing program is certainly one which is of great concern to every Member of the Senate. We recognize that, in view of the way the Military Establishment is developing, we are

getting an Army, an Air Force, and a Navy in which there are many older men. That grows out of the fact that we have a technological development in military affairs these days which requires some persons to have exceptional skills, and those skills are not acquired overnight. We cannot conduct a modern Army or a modern Air Force or a modern Navy and depend on 18-month enlistments or 2-year terms for the backbone of the services. We must have men who have been in the service for some period of time, in order to have personnel who will be effective in handling the machines and scientific equipment in use today.

Consequently, Mr. President, we get older men, men with families. They will not stay in the service unless they have adequate housing. The committee is entirely sympathetic with providing decent housing for these persons. At the same time we have the same responsibility in the connection that we have in passing on other requests, and that is keeping the requests within the financial capabilities of the country.

The so-called Wherry housing was a device developed to permit the financing of new housing construction without requiring money immediately to be raised by taxes or by the sale of bonds.

Under that program, and its successor, Capehart housing, a great deal of additional housing is being provided. However, even that is presenting some problems, because of the financing involved. In the housing bill passed by Congress a year ago, as supplemented by the housing bill passed this year, there is a provision that Capehart housing projects shall not be undertaken until the military acquires the existing Wherry housing projects on the same installations. Personally, I think that is a mistake. It is one of the reasons why I voted against the housing bill at this session of Congress. It is unfair to the Government and it is unfair to the Treasury to require that the Military Establishment shall purchase the existing Wherry housing before it can engage in a new Capehart housing project. It is true that a formula was established for pricing the Wherry housing. Nevertheless, I make the prediction this evening that the time will come when Congress will regret the mandatory provisions with respect to the purchase of the Wherry housing before the Capehart housing is undertaken.

I say that because when we tell the Government it must buy a certain piece of property before it can engage in the building of a new piece of property, the Government is placed at a disadvantage in negotiating. Some of the Wherry housing was attended by so-called windfall profits for the sponsors of the projects, who got large guaranteed loans and then got a change of orders, or, by one development or another, built for less than the amount of the loan.

Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 7 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, would the Senator describe the Wherry housing? I am not familiar with it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will do so very briefly. The Wherry housing was built in accordance with a provision under which a sponsor could propose to the Government that it would build some housing at a Military Establishment, with the understanding that it would be adjacent to a military installation, and that the clients for the housing would be military personnel. The military personnel were entitled to quarters allowance, and out of that allowance they paid the rent for the housing. At the conclusion of a certain number of years, most of that housing will become the property of the Government.

When the authorization for the Wherry housing expired, the Capehart housing came into being. The Capehart housing is a similar type of venture.

During the past 2 years the housing bills have carried the requirement that the Capehart housing shall not be undertaken until existing Wherry housing has been purchased.

That grew out of the fact that much Wherry housing is substandard, and the Wherry housing sponsors, or the owners of the present Wherry projects, were afraid that if better housing were built under the Capehart housing program, they would be left with some vacancies.

Congress, therefore, provided in the housing bill that the Government would have to purchase the Wherry housing before it went ahead and provided better housing.

The formula in the housing bill provides what is supposed to be a fair price to the owner of the Wherry housing. However, in many instances the Wherry housing today could not be reconstructed for the price at which it was built, or for the price at which it was acquired by the present owners and operators of such housing. The result is that the present owners of the Wherry housing would like to get the benefit of the increased value, or unearned increment, so to speak, if they sell to the Government. I refer to it as an unearned increment because in many instances the enhancement in value has been due to the existence of a Government establishment itself. The housing is adjacent to military installations. Such housing has increased in value, not because of the enterprise of the owner of the Wherry housing, but because of the increased investment in and growth of the military installation.

Therefore, I have not felt that the owner of Wherry housing should have the benefit of an enhancement in value to which such owner made no contribution, but which was due in many instances to the additional investment of the Government itself, or due to the inflation of construction costs. Therefore, I have felt that we should not provide for a mandatory buying of Wherry housing, but that a fair price should be offered for it, and that should be the end of it. If the owners did not want to take it, they could continue to operate the Wherry housing.

The alternative to negotiation under the mandatory provision is that the owner of the Wherry housing can go to court and get a court determination.

That does take from the Government, I suppose, and from Congress, the burden of paying a high price for the property. I recognize that there have been through the years established principles of law as to how high a price must be paid when property is taken for Government use. However, when the Government is not free, as in this instance, to determine whether it wants to take the housing, the Government should not be bound by the ordinary rules of eminent domain, when the property is taken for Government use.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What were the windfalls the private owners enjoyed in the construction?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The windfalls which the private owners enjoyed, as nearly as I can recall the instances which were brought out by the investigation conducted by the Committee on Finance, related to a sponsor of a project, for example, getting an insured loan for X number of dollars, and then building the project for Y number of dollars, which latter amount was less than the amount of the insured loan.

In many cases the present owner of the property is not responsible for that, because the present owner, in many instances, is a corporation which bought out the interests of the original corporation, and those who might now get a windfall through an enhancement of value might not be the same ones who got the original windfall. In some cases it could be.

In any event, I sought to work out a formula whereby the committee could modify the action which was taken on the housing bill. However, I was not able to work out language on which the subcommittee members could agree. I think there is a general feeling in the committee, however, that we shall watch very closely the takings of the Wherry housing, and that the committee will be reluctant to give approval to the starting of Capehart housing projects if it feels that there has been any undue payment of windfalls to Wherry housing owners in the development of the proposed new projects.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a half minute?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree heartily with most of what the Senator from South Dakota has said, and also to thank him for the excellent work he has done in connection with the Wherry housing program. As for myself, the only reason why we did not fully agree with him in his proposal concerning the change of the formula was that we thought another year's experience, especially in the light of the slight change which has already been made in the formula, would be helpful. We hope that another year will bring a case into court which will test some of the questions and will obtain an evaluation of approach by the court. For those reasons, we do not fully agree

with the Senator in his amendment. But his work has been very constructive and helpful in dealing with a knotty problem which has no easy answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes from the time on the bill.

I think the saving factor in the situation is that new Capehart projects will require clearance from the committee. Before the committee will grant clearance, I assume we will want to have a complete record with reference to the treatment of the existing Wherry housing project. We think that if the Government is going to be bilked, we will certainly deny approval of the Capehart project.

I wish to address myself in the few minutes remaining to a larger problem. The Senator from Mississippi, our chairman, has already referred to the decision which the committee had to make with respect to Nike. I think he expressed the sentiment of all of us when he stated that we were not happy about the large investment in the so-called Nike system. In fact, I should like to read for the information of Senators present a paragraph which appears in the middle of page 22 of the report, in which the committee said:

In view of the foregoing, the committee seriously considered recommending that no further authorization be approved to expand the existing Nike system. It does not so recommend only because the best military advice available strongly recommended that the committee approve the program. The committee thoroughly reviewed the subject. It was made the topic of a special classified briefing conducted by a representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and senior departmental witnesses. Results of this briefing were such as to convince the committee that even though it still has doubts, it has no other recourse than to recommend the Nike funds be authorized in this year's construction program.

I wish to read also the paragraph in which the report quotes from an article written by Henry A. Kissinger, entitled "Strategy and Organization," and published in Foreign Affairs magazine for April 1957:

In the absence of a generally understood doctrine, our actions will of necessity prove haphazard; conflicting proposals will compete with each other without an effective basis for their resolution. Each problem, as it arises, will seem novel and energies will be absorbed in analyzing its nature rather than in seeking solutions. Our services will find it impossible to make a meaningful choice among the mass of new weapons with which their research and development programs will soon overwhelm them. We will continue to cede the initiative to others and our course will become increasingly defensive.

Because of this problem—and it is a very grave problem, one which our colleague on the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], has referred to as the philosophy which is involved in our defense policies—I suggest that I think the time has come for the President to appoint a commission to examine the structure of the Defense Department, and to consider the possible

simplification of our present triplication of armed services by creating two basic combat services of land-based air and sea-based air.

The aims of such a study should be the age-old goals of all basic studies—efficiency and economy. In the present state of affairs, however, they are urged by the necessities of security abroad and well being at home and are dictated by the increasing competition of both the weapon users and the weapon makers.

My thought is that possibly today's realities call for 2 basic air-age combat forces, 1 land and 1 sea based, each completely integrated and equipped with trained personnel and weapon systems providing proper balances between air and surface capabilities, and each designed to meet not only the needs of a purely military situation, but equally, if not more importantly, our Nation's need in the political-military area.

Mr. President, normally we think of defense as purely a military proposition. But as the series of articles which Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts is writing and which is currently being published in the Washington Post and Times Herald points out, today we are confronted by the necessity of the political values and the political impact of our military posture.

So the Commission I am proposing should consider, I think, not merely the weapons system and the military aspects, but also it should consider the impact of our military posture in the political-military area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The specific questions which should be considered by such a Commission as I have suggested are these:

First. Are we slipping into a dangerous Maginot-line type of defense planning, as is evidenced by the millions of dollars being spent on point defense systems?

Second. Is it too expensive to let each service interpret its roles, as witness the military rivalries touched off in Red Stone and Matador, Atlas and Jupiter, Nike and Talos, and Bomarc?

Third. The Commission should consider whether we are wasting the abilities of outstanding men by the natural limitations on interservice use of personnel. I could elaborate on that proposal, and I shall at another time. I think brilliant men are serving in one branch of the Military Establishment whose services ought to be directly available to the other branches of the Military Establishment.

Fourth. Should the airlift be transferred to the Army? Or should the Army become an integral part of a land-based air wing of the armed services, integrated into the Air Defense and Tactical Air Commands?

Fifth. What economics can be achieved by further joint use of procurement, storage, hospitalization, transportation, and other facilities of a common character?

Such a study should provide answers which would be helpful in our overall

problems of security, inflation, and sound national economy. Nothing could be more disastrous than to have rivalry in weapons and contracts exhaust our materials, skills, and means. Nothing contributes more to inflation than unbalanced wage-spending power created by producing goods which wage earners do not buy.

The early retirement of senior officers in recent years affords an ample reserve of qualified men who could serve on such a Presidential commission. I earnestly commend such a proposal to the attention of the administration.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment I had heretofore offered. On the time allotted on the bill, I may say that the bill has been available to Senators for several days. The report also has been published, and all who are interested in it have had the chance to obtain it. Many Senators have communicated with members of the subcommittee and the staff of the subcommittee. I think there is great unanimity generally in support of the bill. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary to ask for a yea-and-nay vote, unless the leadership should particularly want it.

I yield back such time as I may have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, this will be the last bill for which the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, has had some very definite responsibility. The reductions in the authorizations under the bill are in large part due to the efficiency and to the masterly command which Mr. Wilson has had of the Defense Department.

When he took office, he asked that all the outstanding authorizations for military construction be reviewed, and that any construction program which was not at least 5 percent underway should be reevaluated.

In 1953, the military construction bill, under that directive, accomplished a rescission and a programming of authorizations in the amount of approximately \$720 million—almost three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Under the leadership of Mr. Wilson there has been a continual review of these outstanding authorizations. The pending bill liquidates any authorizations over 4 years old. I think in last year's bill, any authorization over 5 years of age was liquidated.

The outstanding authorizations at the end of the fiscal year 1957 were in excess of \$2 billion. Under the policies recommended by the Secretary, and followed by the committee, the outstanding authorizations at the conclusion of the fiscal year 1958 will be approximately

\$1,700,000,000—or a considerable reduction. Certainly, that is the right direction in which to travel. I desire to mention this as one of the ways in which I believe Secretary Wilson has earned the title of one of the greatest Secretaries of Defense the Nation has ever had.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to use 1 minute of the time I have yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to commend Assistant Secretary Bryant for the very fine work he has done as Assistant Secretary of Defense; and also I desire to commend the splendid contributions made by Mr. Edward J. Sheridan, who is chief of Mr. Bryant's staff, and also is his Director of Construction. These gentlemen have been very helpful to us, and have been very sincere and diligent in their work. They are very capable men.

I also desire to thank Secretary Wilson for the work he has done as Secretary of Defense. I think he has made a real contribution; and his energy and his rugged sincerity and his willingness to express himself in so frank a manner have all contributed greatly to the doing of a job which is most difficult, indeed. Its size is beyond one's comprehension, unless one has made a study of the vastly complicated matters involved. Secretary Wilson has made a distinct contribution, and all of us are most indebted to him for what he has done.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to have some time yielded to him?

Mr. THYE. I should like to take a moment or two to pay a tribute to these gentlemen.

Mr. STENNIS. Will 2 minutes be sufficient for the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well; I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I desire to pay my tribute to those in the Department of Defense who have aided and assisted in connection with the matters coming before the committee, by supplying the information needed in connection with the pending bill.

I wish to join my colleagues in the tributes they have paid to these gentlemen. I believe that history will prove that Charles Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, not only has performed with outstanding ability, but also has shown a tremendous amount of courage and good commonsense. As Secretary of Defense, I believe he has given the administration of President Eisenhower real administrative leadership, and he has given the Nation a Department of Defense and an industrial rebirth, so to speak, in the military, including the ordnance plants, which have brought to the Nation military strength of the most efficient type. So I desire to commend

Charles Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, for having done an outstanding job.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 8240) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as passed by the Senate, be printed, showing the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT IN THE NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nothing is pending at the present time. The Chair is waiting for the next bill to be called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thought a unanimous-consent order had been entered. However, at this time I ask that, under the previous order, the unfinished business—namely, Calendar No. 812, House bill 8643, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power, and for other purposes, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 812, House bill 8643, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that, under the order, the Senate will now resume the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8643) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement under which the bill is being considered, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8643, the Niagara power bill, debate upon an amendment to be

proposed by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. LAUSCHE), on page 2, line 21, or upon any motion or amendment relating thereto, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled by Mr. CLARK and the majority leader; that upon any other amendment or motion, debate shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided, and controlled by the mover of any such amendment and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any amendment proposed to the bill, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the bill shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided further*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, my only reason for requesting that the unanimous-consent agreement be read—of course it has already been entered—is that inasmuch as it was entered earlier in the day, and inasmuch as there has not been an opportunity to have it printed, I thought it would be well to have it read at this time, for the information of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Several days ago, several amendments were printed and circulated; they are amendments to the Senate bill, and are identical to proposed amendments to the House bill which now has been called up.

I wish to know whether the amendments thus submitted to the Senate bill will be considered pertinent to the House bill, which I did not realize would be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to any amendment.

Mr. CLARK. So the amendments already prepared and distributed as amendments to the Senate bill may be called up, and may be offered to the House bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; so long as the amendments are germane to the bill.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time, I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time required therefor not be taken out of the time available under the order already entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bible	Carroll
Allott	Brierley	Case, N. J.
Anderson	Bush	Case, S. Dak.
Barrett	Butler	Chavez
Beall	Byrd	Church
Bennett	Carlson	Clark

Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Cotton	Kefauver	Revercomb
Curtis	Kerr	Robertson
Dirksen	Knowland	Russell
Douglas	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Langer	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lausche	Scott
Ervin	Long	Smathers
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Goldwater	Mansfield	Smith, N. J.
Green	Martin, Iowa	Sparkman
Hayden	Martin, Pa.	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Symington
Hill	McNamara	Talmadge
Holland	Monroney	Thurmond
Hruska	Morse	Thye
Humphrey	Morton	Watkins
Ives	Mundt	Wiley
Jackson	Murray	Williams
Javits	Neuberger	Yarborough
Jenner	O'Mahoney	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Potter	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASMORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate in order to represent the Senate at the Latin American Economic Conference in Buenos Aires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], 5 minutes' time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am most thankful for the kindness of the Senator from Texas in yielding me 5 minutes. I think the bill is of sufficient importance to the American people that one should be thankful for 5 minutes.

Mr. President, development of hydroelectric power at Niagara Falls, N. Y., was first undertaken by private enterprise over 60 years ago. Since that time there have been many proposals for additional development of power at that location.

A treaty between the United States and Canada was ratified in 1950 providing for additional diversion of waters at Niagara Falls for power purposes, and dividing such diversions between the two countries. The treaty contained a reservation that no project for use of the United States share of the water would be undertaken until specifically authorized by act of Congress. The treaty also provided that either country could utilize the other's share of water until

that country completed its power installation.

Since ratification of the 1950 treaty, various bills have been introduced in each Congress providing for development of the available power on the American side of the river, but action has not been completed on the proposed legislation. In the meantime, power installations have been completed on the Canadian side, and they are now utilizing the United States share of the water provided by the treaty.

The Committee on Public Works has held numerous hearings on the measures introduced in each Congress.

I want to thank the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who has no direct interest in the proposed legislation whatsoever, for his patience in giving his time and energy to it.

During the 83d Congress the committee reported a bill providing for the development of the power at Niagara Falls. During the 84th Congress the committee reported such a bill and it was passed by the Senate, but was not passed by the House. At that time there were two proposals for the power development before the committee. One would have directed the Federal Power Commission to issue a license to a private corporation for the development of the power, and the other one would have directed the Commission to issue a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York, with public-preference provisions included in such license. The latter bill was the one passed by the Senate.

There were two bills before the Committee on Public Works during the present session of Congress. Each would direct the Federal Power Commission to issue a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York for construction and operation of the Niagara Falls project. One would give preference to public agencies in the distribution of the power, the other would not.

The committee held hearings on these bills. The chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], worked diligently with the various interested parties in working out a compromise bill in order that the development of the power at Niagara could proceed. The compromise bill was approved by the committee and reported to the Senate, and that is the bill now before us.

Senate bill 2406 directs the Federal Power Commission to issue a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York, requiring that 50 percent of the power developed at Niagara Falls be made available at the lowest rates reasonably possible to public bodies and nonprofit organizations within economic transmission distance. If the power subject to the preference provisions is sold to utility companies, the bill requires that flexible arrangements be made to withdraw, on reasonable notice and fair terms, enough power to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of the preference customers.

The bill also provides that a reasonable portion of the power subject to the preference provisions shall be made available to neighboring States within

reasonable economic transmission distance, in an amount not to exceed 20 percent of that power subject to the preference provisions.

The Power Authority of the State of New York was established by the legislature of that State for the specific purpose of developing the available power at Niagara Falls and the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. The Federal Power Commission granted a license to the authority for development of the St. Lawrence power, and construction on that project is nearing completion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Texas for his kindness.

The power authority now desires a license and is ready to develop the Niagara power in conjunction with the St. Lawrence project. Integration and interconnection of these two great projects will increase their feasibility and prove advantageous to the region and to the State.

It should be noted that the State power authority obtains its funds from the sale of revenue bonds, just as any private power company would do, with appropriations from the State treasury. There are no Federal funds involved in this case.

The Niagara Falls project is potentially one of the greatest hydroelectric power projects on the North American Continent. No dams or provisions for storage of water are necessary. That storage is provided by the Great Lakes, which insure a fairly constant regulated flow in the Niagara River. The power head is provided by the fall in the river which is concentrated in the Niagara area.

The Buffalo-Niagara area contains a heavy concentration of industry, including electrochemical and electrometallurgical processing industries that require a vast amount of power for their operations; and unless low-cost power can be made available they cannot continue to operate. The bill makes provisions for meeting the emergency situation created for industry in the area by the collapse of the Schoellkopf powerplant of the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. on June 7, 1956.

The New York and New England area has the highest power rate of any section of the country. It is hoped that the Niagara project will provide a source of cheap, dependable power that will provide an adequate yardstick and permit lower power rates and greater use of electricity over a large part of the northeastern section of our country.

Senate bill 2406 is a committee bill. It has the endorsement of the people of the area, the State officials, and representatives of the private-power companies of the region. It complies with the provisions of the 1950 treaty, the Federal Power Act, and the laws of the State of New York. It is not inconsistent with the New York public authori-

ties law, nor does it conflict with any State law that might prevent the authority from accepting a license subject to the conditions of S. 2406. The power from the project is urgently needed by the existing industries in the area, many of them vital to the defense of this Nation.

I urge immediate enactment of the bill.

Mr. President, I pay my respects to and express appreciation, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, of the diligent work and energy of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who has worked so hard on this bill, notwithstanding the fact that he had no particular direct interest in it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New York on the bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have labored for 7 years on the effort to resolve the Niagara power controversy. Today the Senate has before it a bill which offers the bright hope that, at long last, that controversy shall be ended. And ended it must be, at this session of the Congress. One consideration is paramount—that construction of this project may begin immediately to meet a desperate need for additional hydroelectric power from the waters of the Niagara River.

My efforts during these 7 years have been devoted to helping to bring the parties at interest together. It has been a lengthy and most difficult task. The bill before us is a compromise. As such it cannot please all of the parties at interest in all of its details; in fact, it cannot please anyone completely. But it is a bill that all of the parties can live with, a bill that will produce the power and distribute it equitably. It is a bill which will rescue a vital industrial area from a decline threatening it by virtue of the high cost and temporary nature of emergency power now being obtained from Canada.

In this connection, I point out that this is the first time that all the interests in New York State—political, economic, business, and other interests—have united on a bill of this nature. Democrats and Republicans, private power interests and public power interests are united in favor of the bill.

As we know, this bill is before us because the Senate attached a reservation to the 1950 treaty with Canada which divides the waters of the Niagara River between the United States and Canada. That reservation specified that the Congress must pass upon the development of future hydroelectric power from the American share of the Niagara's waters.

The controversy began as a struggle between advocates of a Federal power project on the one hand and of private enterprise on the other. Late in 1951, however, I proposed that the State of New York build the project in accordance with the law of New York State providing for State development. The extremes of the controversy are implicit in the legislative history of this issue. In the 83d Congress, the House passed a bill providing for development of the project by private enterprise. The Sen-

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

H. R. 8240

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 12, 1957

Ordered to be printed with the amendment of the Senate

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and
for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish
5 or develop military installations and facilities for acquiring,
6 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
7 manent or temporary public works, including the prepara-
8 tion, appurtenances, utilities and equipment for the following
9 projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL GROUND FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing,
\$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,
000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,
000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities,
and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility,
\$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational
and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and
development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facili-
ties, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,
530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Opera-
tional facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facili-
ties, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,229,000.

1 Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington:
2 Land acquisition, \$40,000.

3 Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities,
4 and utilities, \$110,000.

5 Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility,
6 and land acquisition, \$95,000.

7 (Chemical Corps)

8 Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

9 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,-
10 000.

11 (Signal Corps)

12 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

13 (Corps of Engineers)

14 Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Re-
15 search and development facility, \$2,496,000.

16 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training
17 facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

18 Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-
19 000.

20 (Transportation Corps)

21 Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,
22 \$1,169,000.

23 Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational
24 facilities, \$306,000.

1 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-
 2 ing, administrative facility, and utilities, \$3,039,000.

3 Oakland Army Base, California: Medical facility,
 4 \$602,000.

5 (Medical Corps)

6 Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop
 7 housing, \$937,000.

8 Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Util-
 9 ities, \$1,920,000.

10 FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

11 (First Army Area)

12 Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-
 13 tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and
 14 utilities, \$4,859,000.

15 Fort Dix, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, \$303,000.

16 (Second Army Area)

17 A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-
 18 ing, \$153,000.

19 Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-
 20 nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

21 Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Administrative facil-
 22 ity, troop housing and community facilities, \$2,652,000.

23 Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$5,703,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,231,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

~~(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)~~

~~(Alaskan Area)~~

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

~~(Pacific Command Area)~~

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

~~(Caribbean Command Area)~~

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Community facility, and utilities, \$273,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

~~(United States Army, Europe)~~

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

~~(Army Forces Far East)~~

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
5 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
6 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
7 military tactical installations for assignment as public
8 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
9 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
10 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
11 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
12 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
13 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
14 structed with appropriated funds.

15 SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
16 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
17 STATES" in section 101, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
19 TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,
20 Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,212,000".

22 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as

amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts “\$44,003,000” and “\$133,671,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,000”, respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out “\$2,360,000” and insert in place thereof “\$3,137,000”.

Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Military Academy)” with respect to United States Military Academy, New York, strike out “\$9,950,000” and insert in place thereof “\$11,983,000”.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts “\$129,096,000” and “\$236,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$131,906,000” and “238,870,000”, respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,

1 as amended, is amended under the heading "~~CONTINENTAL~~
2 ~~UNITED STATES~~" in section 101, as follows:

3 Under the subheading "~~TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-~~
4 ~~TIES (Ordnance Corps)~~"—

5 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,
6 Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place
7 thereof "\$2,039,000".

8 (2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
9 York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof
10 "\$212,000".

11 Under the subheading "~~TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-~~
12 ~~TIES (Quartermaster Corps)~~" with respect to Fort Lee,
13 Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof
14 "\$9,874,000".

15 Under the subheading "~~TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-~~
16 ~~TIES (Chemical Corps)~~"—

17 (1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,
18 strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof
19 "\$525,000".

20 (2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,
21 Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place
22 thereof "\$1,491,000".

23 Under the subheading "~~TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-~~
24 ~~TIES (Transportation Corps)~~"—

25 (1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New

York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$1,240,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out
"\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,072,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Medical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$876,000".

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Washington,
strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$669,000".

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000"
and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Maryland,
strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$800,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, South
Carolina, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof
"\$10,400,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,

1 strike out “\$12,922,000” and insert in place thereof
2 “\$14,283,000”.

3 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
4 (Fifth Army Area)”—

5 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
6 out “\$7,487,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,621,
7 000”.

8 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
9 strike out “\$8,615,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “9,893,000”.

11 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
12 out “\$145,000” and insert in place thereof “\$193,000”.

13 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
14 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)”—with respect
15 to various installations, strike out “\$3,014,000” and insert
16 in place thereof “\$3,204,000”.

17 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
18 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
19 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 101 as follows:

20 Under the subheading “Alaskan Area”—with respect to
21 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out “\$469,000” and insert
22 in place thereof “\$559,000”.

23 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
24 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
25 502 the amounts “\$225,277,000”, “\$74,984,000”, and

1 “\$534,254,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$240,220,-
2 000”, “\$75,074,000”, and “\$549,287,000”, respectively.

3 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
4 is amended under the heading “INSIDE THE UNITED
5 STATES” in section 101 as follows:

6 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
7 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

8 (1) with respect to Seneea Ordnance Depot, New
9 York, strike out “\$88,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$136,000”.

11 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
12 strike out “\$6,159,000” and insert in place thereof
13 “\$8,593,000”.

14 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
15 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—

16 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
17 out “\$832,000” and insert in place thereof “\$984,000”.

18 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
19 Texas, strike out “\$1,285,000” and insert in place
20 thereof “\$1,847,000”.

21 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES”—

22 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
23 “\$5,301,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,293,000”.

24 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
25 “\$4,173,000” and insert in place thereof “\$5,798,000”.

1 David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland:
2 Utilities, \$115,000.

3 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
4 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$1,500,000.

5 Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:
6 Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

7 Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$2,
8 998,000.

9 Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Medical
10 facilities, \$391,000.

11 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

12 Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,
13 \$1,326,000.

14 Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront
15 facilities, \$544,000.

16 Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,
17 community facilities and utilities, \$3,312,000.

18 Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia: Waterfront facilities,
19 \$7,808,000.

20 AVIATION FACILITIES

21 (Naval Air Training Stations)

22 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Oper-
23 ational facilities, \$566,000.

24 Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational
25 facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Glyneo, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

2 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-
3 tional facilities, (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

4 Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:
5 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$15,-
6 067,000.

7 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana:
8 Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

9 Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational
10 facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,-
11 225,000.

12 Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida:
13 Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
14 \$39,000.

15 (Fleet Support Air Stations)

16 Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational
17 facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

18 Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational
19 facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

20 Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational
21 facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition,
22 \$7,751,000.

23 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Califor-
24 nia: Operational facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility),
25 \$39,000.

1 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:
2 Operational facilities, \$199,000.

3 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:
4 Operational facilities, messhall, and land acquisition,
5 \$4,774,000.

6 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-
7 ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

8 Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:
9 Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,
10 and utilities, \$5,728,000.

11 Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational
12 facilities, (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

13 Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational
14 facilities, (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

15 Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-
16 cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$30,594,000.

17 Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-
18 tional facilities, \$384,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational fa-
20 cilities, \$3,401,000.

21 Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facili-
22 ties, and maintenance facilities, \$5,467,000.

23 Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:
24 Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

1 Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and
 2 training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground
 3 improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

4 Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Opera-
 5 tional facilities, (aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

6 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,
 7 California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and
 8 utilities, \$9,448,000.

9 Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Op-
 10 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

11 (Marine Corps Air Stations)

12 Marine Corps Auxiliary, Air Station, Beaufort, South
 13 Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and admin-
 14 istrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

15 Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-
 16 lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-
 17 trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground
 18 improvements, \$6,503,000.

19 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-
 20 tional facilities, \$3,620,000.

21 Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California:
 22 Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

23 Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:
 24 Operational facilities, and utilities, \$132,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$2,209,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$3,479,000.

Naval Air Facility, John H. Towers Field (location to be determined): Land acquisition, \$3,200,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$8,001,000.

1 Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina:
2 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and util-
3 ities, \$4,256,000.

4 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Caro-
5 lina: Training facilities, troop housing and community facili-
6 ties, and utilities, \$3,199,000.

7 Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Opera-
8 tional facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

9 Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Community
10 facilities, development and test facilities, supply facilities,
11 troop housing, and utilities, \$2,213,000.

12 Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California:
13 Training facilities, \$116,000.

14 Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms,
15 California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-
16 istrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

17 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

18 Naval Ammunition Depot, Banger, Washington: Utili-
19 ties, \$316,000.

20 Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California:
21 Supply facilities, \$114,000.

22 Naval Ordnance Laboratory, Corona, California: Re-
23 search and development facilities, \$494,000.

24 Ordnance Aerophysies Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas:
25 Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

1 Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Mary-
 2 land: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

3 Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Maintenance
 4 facilities, and utilities, \$723,000.

5 SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

6 Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory
 7 foundations, \$1,602,000.

8 Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, South Carolina:
 9 Troop housing, \$1,225,000.

10 Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training
 11 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

12 Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training
 13 facilities, and troop housing, \$5,375,000.

14 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

15 Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-
 16 ational facilities, \$443,000.

17 Naval Communication Station, Newport, Rhode Island:
 18 Operational facilities, \$1,397,000.

19 Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:
 20 Operational facilities, \$100,000.

21 Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Op-
 22 erational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

23 Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Op-
 24 erational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

1 OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

2 Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Re-
3 search and development facilities, \$180,000.

4 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

5 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,-
6 000.

7 Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,-
8 244,000.

9 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,
10 California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
11 \$759,000.

12 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

13 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

14 Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Ha-
15 waii: Waterfront facilities, and operational facilities, \$6,-
16 076, 000.

17 Naval Base, Subie Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
18 Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and
19 community facilities, and utilities, \$3,287,000.

20 Naval Station, Subie Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
21 Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
22 ground improvements, \$8,993,000.

23 FLEET BASE FACILITIES

24 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
25 munity facilities, and family housing \$1,005,000.

1 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
2 bor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administration facilities and
3 utilities, \$332,000.

4 ~~Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, \$4,~~
5 ~~699,000.~~

6 Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,-
7 000.

~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~

9 Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Op-
10 erational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,
11 000.

12 Naval Station, Argentina, Canada: Family housing and
13 community facilities, \$1,793,000.

14 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of
15 Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),
16 \$2,088,000.

17 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-
18 lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

19 Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational
20 facilities, \$5,730,000.

21 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-
22 tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

23 Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational
24 facilities (Tactical air navigation facilities), \$69,000.

1 Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:
 2 Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),
 3 \$69,000.

4 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facili-
 5 ties at White Beach, \$504,000.

6 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Oper-
 7 ational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-
 8 ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

9 SUPPLY FACILITIES

10 Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities,
 11 \$1,550,000.

12 Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community
 13 facilities, \$884,000.

14 Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine
 15 Islands: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$2,098,000.

16 ORDNANCE FACILITIES

17 Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii:
 18 Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition,
 19 \$904,000.

20 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

21 Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop
 22 housing, \$1,053,000.

23 Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Operational facilities,
 24 and troop housing, \$898,000.

1 Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mari-
2 ana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

3 Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Op-
4 erational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

5 Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Opera-
6 tional facilities, \$69,000.

7 Naval Security Group Activity, southern Japan: Op-
8 erational facilities, housing, and utilities and ground im-
9 provements, \$726,000.

10 Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of
11 Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

12 YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

13 Public Works Center, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities,
14 \$1,093,000.

15 Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Is-
16 lands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

17 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or
18 develop classified naval installations and facilities by con-
19 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
20 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
21 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
22 total amount of \$65,091,000.

23 SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-

gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "~~CON-~~
~~TINENTAL UNITED STATES~~" in section 201, as follows:

Under the subheading "~~YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-~~
~~TIES~~", with respect to "~~Various locations~~", strike out "~~\$4,-~~
~~500,000~~" and insert in place thereof "~~\$5,460,000~~".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "~~\$86,-~~
~~397,000~~" and inserting in place thereof "~~\$95,489,000~~".

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of
 section 402 the amounts "~~\$138,183,000~~", "~~\$86,397,-~~
~~000~~", and "~~\$256,875,000~~" and inserting respectively in
 place thereof, "~~\$139,143,000~~", "~~\$95,489,000~~", and
~~"\$266,927,000"~~.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
 as amended, is amended under the heading "~~CONTINENTAL~~
~~UNITED STATES~~" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~" with
 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Cali-
 fornia, strike out "~~\$225,000~~" and insert in place thereof
~~"\$369,000"~~; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station,
 El Toro, California, strike out "~~\$1,675,000~~" and insert in
 place thereof "~~\$2,030,000~~"; and with respect to the Naval
 Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out "~~\$70,000~~" and
 insert in place thereof "~~\$170,000~~".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”, with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, California, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,099,000”.

(2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”, with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out “\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.

(3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)”, with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out “\$3,686,000” and insert in place thereof “\$4,292,000”; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, strike out “\$24,361,000” and insert in place thereof “\$26,871,000”.

1 (4) Under the subheading "~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~
 2 ~~(Fleet Support Air Stations)~~", with respect to the Naval
 3 Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000"
 4 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
 5 the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out
 6 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
 7 and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,
 8 Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
 9 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

10 (5) Under the subheading "~~AVIATION FACILITIES~~
 11 ~~(Special Purpose Air Stations)~~", with respect to the Naval
 12 Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,
 13 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,444".—

14 (6) Under the subheading "~~ORDNANCE FACILITIES~~",
 15 with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,
 16 Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
 17 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval
 18 Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out
 19 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

20 (7) Under the subheading "~~SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-~~
 21 ~~TIES~~" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian
 22 Head, Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place
 23 thereof "\$879,000".

24 (b) Public Law 461, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTI-
2 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

3 (1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES"
4 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall
5 Islands, strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof
6 "\$5,235,000".

7 (2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILI-
8 TIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
9 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and
10 insert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

11 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
12 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,
13 342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

14 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
15 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
16 tion 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300",
17 "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting re-
18 spectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,
19 300", "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

20 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
21 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
22 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

23 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
24 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-

1 line, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof
 2 "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
 3 Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in
 4 place thereof "\$8,169,000".

5 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
 6 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
 7 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,
 8 623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
 9 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
 10 "\$3,340,000".

11 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
 12 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
 13 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000"
 14 and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

15 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
 16 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
 17 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
 18 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

19 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 20 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-
 21 land, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof
 22 "\$10,919,000".

23 (6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-
 24 ITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station,

1 San Francisco, California, strike out “\$2,029,000” and in-
 2 sert in place thereof “\$3,779,000”.

3 (7) Under the subheading “YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
 4 TIES”, with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
 5 Virginia, strike out “\$443,000” and insert in place thereof
 6 “\$500,000”.

7 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 8 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES”
 9 in section 201, as follows:

10 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”,
 11 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
 12 out “\$1,961,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,337,000”.

13 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 14 amended by striking out in section 203, “\$84,043,000” and
 15 inserting in place thereof “\$85,939,000”.

16 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
 17 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
 18 amounts “\$292,572,000”, “\$61,625,000”, “\$84,043,000”,
 19 and “\$438,240,000” and inserting respectively in place
 20 thereof “\$303,453,000”, “\$62,001,000”, “\$85,939,000”,
 21 and “\$451,393,000”.

22 TITLE III

23 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may estab-
 24 lish or develop military installations and facilities by acquir-

1 ing, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing per-
2 manent or temporary public works, including site prepara-
3 tion, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the follow-
4 ing projects:

5 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

6 AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

7 Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Opera-
8 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
9 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
10 \$4,499,000.

11 Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Op-
12 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
13 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

14 Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facili-
15 ties, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and
16 land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

17 Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family
20 housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground
21 improvements, \$2,048,000.

22 Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North
23 Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-
24 cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community
25 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

1 Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:
2 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
3 supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-
4 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,184,000.

5 Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:
6 Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities
7 and ground improvements, \$614,000.

8 Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:
9 Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and
10 ground improvements, \$429,000.

11 K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:
12 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
13 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$905,000.

15 Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-
16 gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
17 community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
18 \$1,299,000.

19 McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-
20 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
21 ground improvements, \$2,103,000.

22 McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply
23 facilities and community facilities, \$289,000.

24 Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
 2 facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-
 3 ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
 4 ments, \$6,804,000.

5 Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New
 6 York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities
 7 and ground improvements, \$974,000.

8 Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Troop
 9 housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities
 10 and ground improvements, \$2,074,000.

11 Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-
 12 nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,
 13 troop housing community facilities, and utilities and ground
 14 improvements, \$2,082,000.

15 Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Land ae-
 16 quisition, \$136,000.

17 Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:
 18 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
 19 supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
 20 \$4,328,000.

21 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:
 22 Community facilities, \$244,000.

23 Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:
 24 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-
 25 ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

1 Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:
2 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
3 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

4 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

6 Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply
7 facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
8 ments, and real estate improvement, \$2,149,000.

9 Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,
10 New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities
11 and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,144,000.

12 Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Community facilities,
13 utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real
14 estate improvements, \$1,128,000.

15 Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
17 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

18 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-
19 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
20 facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities
21 and ground improvement, \$2,909,000.

22 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:
23 Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$358,000.

25 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,

1 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
2 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housng, community
3 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acqui-
4 sition, \$48,178,000.

5 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

6 Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Troop
7 housing, \$405,000.

8 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
9 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
10 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
11 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
12 and land acquisition, \$10,659,000.

13 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
14 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

15 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
16 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
17 \$899,000.

18 Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania:
19 Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

20 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
21 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
22 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
24 ments, \$5,133,000.

1 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
 2 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

3 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
 4 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
 5 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
 6 improvements, and land acquisition, \$20,507,000.

7 Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:
 8 Community facilities, \$56,000.

9 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:
 10 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop
 11 housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

12 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:
 13 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
 14 and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
 15 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
 16 \$2,077,000.

17 AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

18 Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research
 19 development, and test facilities, troop housing, community
 20 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land
 21 acquisition, \$6,784,000.

22 AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

23 Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-
 24 tional and training facilities, research, development, and test

1 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
 2 provements, \$1,987,000.

3 Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:
 4 Operational and training facilities, research, development,
 5 and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
 6 utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

7 Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada:
 8 Community facilities, \$206,000.

9 Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:
 10 Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
 11 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,823,000.

12 Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:
 13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
 14 research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,
 15 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
 16 land acquisition, \$4,029,000.

17 Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational
 18 and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-
 19 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
 20 improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,962,000.

21 AIR TRAINING COMMAND

22 Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational
 23 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
 24 ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
 25 and land acquisition, \$4,785,000.

1 Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

3 Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, and community facilities,
5 \$489,000.

6 Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-
7 munity facilities, and land acquisition, \$424,000.

8 Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational
9 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
10 ties, \$2,209,000.

11 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
12 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
13 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,110,000.

14 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
15 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
17 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

18 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

21 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
23 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

24 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
25 facilities, \$436,000.

1 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
2 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

3 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

6 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
8 \$5,909,000.

9 Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Utilities and
10 ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate
11 improvements, \$653,000.

12 Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-
13 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
14 facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,
15 \$4,200,000.

16 Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,
17 and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

18 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
20 \$1,977,000.

21 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements
24 \$4,118,000.

25 Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Mainte-

1 nance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$865,000.

3 AIR UNIVERSITY

4 Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land
5 acquisition, \$50,000.

6 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

7 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical
8 facilities, \$952,000.

9 Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-
10 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

11 Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-
12 ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
13 \$337,000.

14 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

15 Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,
16 Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

17 Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:
18 Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

19 Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-
20 lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-
21 ments, \$2,216,000.

22 Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational
23 and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground
24 improvements, \$2,089,000.

25 McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:

1 Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,
2 and land acquisition, \$496,000.

3 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

4 Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational
5 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community
6 facilities, \$848,000.

7 Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:
8 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
9 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
10 \$3,344,000.

11 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
12 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
13 facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and
14 ground improvements, \$9,680,000.

15 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
16 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
17 facilities, \$1,487,000.

18 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
20 \$5,557,000.

21 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
22 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
23 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
24 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

25 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-

1 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
2 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
3 land acquisition, \$9,584,000.

4 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
5 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
6 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

7 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
8 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground
9 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
10 ments, \$2,976,000.

11 Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:
12 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
13 munity facilities, \$536,000.

14 Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-
15 erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
16 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
17 utilities and ground improvements, \$2,468,000.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-
19 tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,411,000.

21 Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and
22 training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
23 community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and
24 land acquisition, \$14,759,000.

1 Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community
2 facilities, \$100,000.

3 Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:
4 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
5 munity facilities, \$2,258,000.

6 Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-
7 erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

8 Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational
9 and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

10 Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-
11 ties, \$34,000.

12 Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, sup-
14 ply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

15 Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-
16 tenance facilities, \$380,000.

17 Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop
18 housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

19 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:
20 Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

21 Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:
22 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-
23 munity facilities, \$13,112,000.

24 Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational
25 and training facilities, \$250,000.

1 Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land
2 acquisition, \$37,000.

3 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-
4 ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
5 and ground improvements, \$2,364,000.

6 Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
8 ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.—

9 MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and
11 ground improvements, \$936,000.

12 Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:
13 Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and
14 utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

15 March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-
16 tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

17 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,
18 Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

20 Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational
21 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
22 ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
23 improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

24 Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:

1 Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$231,000.

3 Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-
4 shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

6 Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational
7 and training facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,
8 utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,
9 \$3,892,000.

10 Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
12 facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-
13 provements, \$3,528,000.

14 Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational
15 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
16 ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

17 Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-
18 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
19 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community
20 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,697,000.

21 Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-
22 setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$1,901,000.

25 Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Oper-

ational and training facilities, and community facilities,
\$235,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,149,000.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,287,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop housing, community facilities and land acquisition, \$1,558,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$760,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,255,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$1,204,000.

1 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
2 facilities, \$745,000.

3 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
4 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
5 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
6 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
7 sition, and real estate improvements, \$11,558,000.

8 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
9 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

10 Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Opera-
11 tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$2,035,000.

12 SPECIAL FACILITIES

13 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
14 \$229,000.

15 AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family
19 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
20 ments, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

21 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

22 ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

23 Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facili-
24 ties, \$430,000.

25 Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training

1 facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities,
2 \$4,742,000.

3 Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities,
4 \$350,000.

5 Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

6 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
7 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
8 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
9 facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acqui-
10 sition, \$11,500,000.

11 AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

12 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
13 and community facilities, \$1,366,000.

14 CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

15 Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational and
16 training facilities, \$1,400,000.

17 FAR EAST AIR FORCES

18 Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational
19 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
20 ties, \$2,642,000.

21 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
22 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
23 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
24 \$12,738,000.

1 MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

2 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
3 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
4 utilities and ground improvements, \$15,006,000.

5 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

6 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities,
7 \$820,000.

8 Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and
9 training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground
10 improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

11 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
12 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-
13 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
14 \$59,613,000.

15 UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

16 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
17 maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-
18 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
19 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate
20 improvements, \$39,217,000.

21 SPECIAL FACILITIES

22 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
23 \$170,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$70,000,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of \$65,000,000.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "~~AIR DEFENSE COMMAND~~" with respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

Under the subheading "~~STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND~~" with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof

1 “\$12,686,000”; and strike out “\$1,463,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$2,756,000”.

3 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
4 MAND”—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
5 stead, New York, strike out “\$729,000” and insert in place
6 thereof “\$929,000”; and strike out “\$686,000” and insert
7 in place thereof “\$886,000”.

8 Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
9 COMMAND”—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
10 Muroc, California, strike out “\$27,478,000” and insert in
11 place thereof “\$29,442,000”; and strike out “\$16,192,000”
12 and insert in place thereof “\$18,156,000”.

13 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
14 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
15 tion 502 so much as reads “\$406,120,000” and “\$415,-
16 949,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$409,937,000” and
17 “\$419,766,000”, respectively.

18 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
19 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading “CONTI-
20 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

21 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

22 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
23 ington, strike out “\$1,716,000” and insert in place
24 thereof “\$2,717,000”;

25 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-

1 kota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof
2 "\$9,220,000";

3 (3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
4 Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000" and
5 insert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

6 (4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike
7 out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,-
8 000";

9 (5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-
10 nard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in
11 place thereof "\$2,935,000";

12 (6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,
13 Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and
14 insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

15 (7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-
16 port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and in-
17 sert in place thereof "\$893,000";

18 (8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,
19 Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place
20 thereof "\$2,676,000".

21 Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"

22 (1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,
23 Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

25 (2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,

1 New York, strike out “\$15,803,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$16,654,000”;

3 (3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,
4 Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and
5 insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;

6 (4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force
7 Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.

9 Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—

10 (1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,
11 Houston, Texas, strike out “\$3,438,000” and insert
12 in place thereof “\$3,876,000”;

13 (2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,
14 San Angelo, Texas, strike out “\$4,081,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$5,088,000”;

16 (3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,
17 Greenville, Mississippi, strike out “\$500,000 and insert
18 in place thereof “\$545,000”;

19 (4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,
20 Harlingen, Texas, strike out “\$446,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$529,000”;

22 (5) with respect to James Connally Air Force
23 Base, Waco, Texas, strike out “\$883,000” and insert
24 in place thereof “\$1,129,000”;

25 (6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base,

1 Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and
 2 insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

3 (7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-
 4 bock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in
 5 place thereof "\$1,304,000";

6 (8) With respect to Williams Air Force Base,
 7 Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert
 8 in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

9 Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—
 10 with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, Dis-
 11 trict of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place
 12 thereof "\$825,000".

13 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
 14 COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force
 15 Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada,
 16 strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,
 17 500".

18 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

19 (1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort
 20 Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in
 21 place thereof "\$7,363,000".

22 (2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor,
 23 Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place
 24 thereof "\$12,218,000";

25 (3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fair-

1 field, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in
2 place thereof "\$11,473,000";

3 (4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-
4 well, New Mexico, strike out "\$6,657,000" and insert
5 in place thereof "\$8,324,000".

6 Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—

7 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
8 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out "\$2,684,000" and
9 insert in place thereof "\$3,527,000";

10 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
11 Peru, Indiana, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place
12 thereof "\$611,000";

13 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
14 ville, California, strike out "\$1,598,000" and insert in
15 place thereof "\$1,905,000";

16 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
17 Lake, Washington, strike out "\$4,724,000" and insert
18 in place thereof "\$5,197,000";

19 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
20 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out "\$3,589,000" and insert
21 in place thereof "\$4,010,000".

22 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
23 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CON-
24 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

25 Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND"—

1 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
 2 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

3 Under the subheading “~~AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL~~
 4 ~~AIDS~~” with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,
 5 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

6 (e) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 7 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
 8 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
 9 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$824,
 10 300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”, re-
 11 spectively.

12 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,
 13 is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL UNITED
 14 STATES” in section 301, as follows:

15 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

16 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
 17 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert in
 18 place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

19 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
 20 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
 21 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

22 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glas-
 23 gow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert in
 24 place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

25 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,

Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

(5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,
Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-
sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;

(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault
Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and
insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;

(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-
port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”
and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;

(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,
North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in
place thereof “\$27,035,000”;

(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-
port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”
and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;

(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,
Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-
sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;

(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,
Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert
in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;

(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-

consin, strike out "\$4,876,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,726,000";

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oseoda, Michigan, strike out "\$3,278,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,808,000";

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out "\$21,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,201,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out "\$17,966,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,005,000";

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out "\$473,000" and insert in place thereof "\$745,000";

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$251,000";

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out "\$5,990,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,763,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base,

1 Amarillo, Texas, strike out “\$17,121,000” and insert
2 in place thereof “\$26,471,000”;

3 (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma,
4 Alabama, strike out “\$18,000” and insert in place
5 thereof “\$22,000”;

6 (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base,
7 Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out “\$24,433,000” and
8 insert in place thereof “\$33,858,000”;

9 (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno,
10 Nevada, strike out “\$2,221,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$3,063,000”;

12 (5) with respect to Vanece Air Force Base, Enid,
13 Oklahoma, strike out “\$977,000” and insert in place
14 thereof “\$1,064,000”.

15 Under the subheading “AIR UNIVERSITY”—with respect
16 to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike
17 out “\$215,000” and insert in place thereof “\$311,000”.

18 Under the subheading “CONTINENTAL AIR COM-
19 MAND”—

20 (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marys-
21 ville, California, strike out “\$13,395,000” and insert
22 in place thereof “\$15,993,000”;

23 (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Mari-
24 etta, Georgia, strike out “\$345,000” and insert in place
25 thereof, “\$500,000”.

1 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
2 COMMAND"—

3 (1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field,
4 Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,939,000" and
5 insert in place thereof "\$7,530,000";

6 (2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
7 Muroc, California, strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert
8 in place thereof "\$7,220,000".

9 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

10 (1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso,
11 Texas, strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof
12 "\$1,190,000";

13 (2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced,
14 California, strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place
15 thereof "\$2,643,000";

16 (3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base,
17 Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "\$14,518,000" and
18 insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";

19 (4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base,
20 Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out "\$943,000" and
21 insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";

22 (5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base,
23 Homestead, Florida, strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert
24 in place thereof "\$1,966,000";

25 (6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base,

1 Columbus, Ohio, strike out “\$4,952,000” and insert in
2 place thereof “\$7,880,000”;

3 ~~(7)~~ with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,
4 Great Falls, Montana, strike out “\$1,236,000” and
5 insert in place thereof “\$1,586,00”;

6 ~~(8)~~ with respect to Mountain Home Air Force
7 Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$2,064,000”
8 and insert in place thereof “\$2,607,000”;

9 ~~(9)~~ with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,
10 Nebraska, strike out “\$5,697,000” and insert in place
11 thereof “\$6,155,000”;

12 ~~(10)~~ with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,
13 Plattsburgh, New York, strike out “\$1,491,000” and
14 insert in place thereof “\$2,027,000”;

15 ~~(11)~~ with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,
16 Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$661,000”
17 and insert in place thereof “\$720,000”;

18 ~~(12)~~ with respect to Walker Air Force Base,
19 Roswell, New Mexico, strike out “\$2,791,000” and
20 insert in place thereof “\$3,181,000”.

21 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—
22 with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Vir-
23 ginia, strike out “\$2,613,000” and insert in place thereof
24 “\$2,785,000”.

25 ~~(b)~~ Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is

1 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED
2 STATES” as follows:

3 Under the subheading “NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND”—
4 with respect to various locations, strike out “\$75,650,000”
5 and insert in place thereof “\$94,197,000”.

6 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
7 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
8 amounts “\$742,873,000”, “\$405,061,000”, and “\$1,360,
9 934,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$811,342,000”,
10 “\$423,608,000”, and “\$1,447,950,000”, respectively.

11 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
12 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
13 read as follows:

14 “(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
15 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
16 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
17 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
18 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
19 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
20 in the next military construction authorization Act would
21 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
22 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
23 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
24 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
25 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:

1 *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
2 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the
3 Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon
4 reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-
5 struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-
6 tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

7 TITLE IV

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department
10 may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-
11 ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and
12 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections
13 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.
14 The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-
15 ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,
16 overhead, planning and supervision incident to construction.
17 That authority may be exercised before title to the land is
18 approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as
19 amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.
20 The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-
21 thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests
22 in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-
23 change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

24 SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such

1 sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but
 2 appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles
 3 I, II, and III shall not exceed—

4 (1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$120,—
 5 099,000; outside the United States, \$34,613,000; see-
 6 tion 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$297,714,000;

7 (2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$260,—
 8 377,000; outside the United States, \$65,627,000; see-
 9 tion 202, \$65,091,000; or a total of \$391,095,000; and

10 (3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$437,—
 11 357,000; outside the United States, \$225,407,000; see-
 12 tion 302, \$65,000,000; or a total of \$727,764,000.

13 SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or
 14 III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-
 15 cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the
 16 United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside
 17 the United States. However, the total cost of all projects
 18 in each such title may not be more than the total amount
 19 authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

20 SEC. 404. Whenever—

21 (1) the President determines that compliance with
 22 section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for
 23 contracts made under this Act for the establishment

1 or development of military installations and facilities in
2 foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out
3 of this Act; and

4 ~~(2)~~ the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
5 General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-
6 quately auditing those contracts;

7 the President may exempt those contracts from the require-
8 ments of that section.

9 SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under
10 this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-
11 petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the
12 national security will not be impaired and the award is con-
13 sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code
14 and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,
15 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall
16 report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the
17 Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to
18 all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to
19 the lowest responsible bidder.

20 SEC. 406. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for
21 military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary
22 of a military department in connection with the establish-
23 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
24 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
25 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and

1 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
2 tion are repealed, except—

3 ~~(1)~~ authorizations for public works and for appro-
4 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
5 titles that contain the general provisions;

6 ~~(2)~~ the authorization for public works projects as
7 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
8 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
9 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

10 ~~(3)~~ the authorization for the rental guaranty for
11 family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is
12 contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-
13 second Congress;

14 ~~(4)~~ the authorizations for public works and the
15 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
16 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended
17 ~~(50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886)~~;

18 ~~(5)~~ the authorization for the development of the
19 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
20 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
21 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

22 ~~(6)~~ Notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
23 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
24 the authorization for ~~(a)~~ development of classified fa-
25 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in

1 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
2 ~~(65 Stat. 336, 343)~~, and ~~(b)~~ development of classified
3 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
4 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
5 ~~(66 Stat. 606, 609)~~; and

6 ~~(7)~~ the authorization for public works and for the
7 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
8 of April 1, 1954 ~~(68 Stat. 47)~~, as amended.

9 SEC. 407. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 ~~(69~~
10 ~~Stat. 324, 352)~~, as amended, is further amended to read
11 as follows:

12 "SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and
13 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,
14 respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or
15 near military tactical installations for assignment as public
16 quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,
17 without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary
18 of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate
19 housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-
20 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
21 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
22 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
23 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
24 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
25 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

1 SEC. 408. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
2 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-
3 ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor
4 area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774,
5 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

6 (b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68
7 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

8 SEC. 409. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
9 follows:

10 (a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following
11 new subsection at the end thereof:

12 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
13 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
14 the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
15 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

16 (b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following
17 new subsection at the end thereof:

18 “(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
19 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members
20 of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
21 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

22 (c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following
23 new subsection at the end thereof:

24 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
25 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of

1 the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net
2 floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

3 SEC. 410. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
4 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
5 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

6 "The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
7 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
8 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
9 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
10 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
11 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
12 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
13 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
14 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
15 operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments
16 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of
17 the foreign currencies used for all such construction or
18 acquisition."

19 SEC. 411. Prior to the termination of, or reduction in
20 the operations of, any commercial or industrial-type activity
21 being conducted on the date of enactment of this Act within
22 any of the forty-eight States or the District of Columbia
23 (other than a nonappropriated fund activity), where such
24 termination or reduction is for the purpose of having the
25 supplies or services furnished by such activity furnished

1 by other than civilian employees of the United States, and
2 where such activity has been conducted for five or more
3 years and requires the services of ten or more civilian em-
4 ployees, the Secretary of Defense shall file with the Presi-
5 dent of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Repre-
6 sentatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed
7 termination or reduction. Such proposed termination or
8 reduction shall not take effect until the expiration of sixty
9 days of continuous session of the Congress following the
10 filing of such report, and shall not then take effect if, during
11 such sixty days either House of the Congress has adopted
12 a resolution which, in effect, disapproves the proposed
13 termination or reduction described in such report. For the
14 purposes of this section, continuity of session shall be con-
15 sidered as broken only by adjournment sine die; but in the
16 computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded
17 the days on which either House is not in session because of
18 an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain.

19 SEC. 412. The authority granted by section 2304 (a)-
20 (1), title 10, United States Code, shall not be exercised
21 during the national emergency declared by the President on
22 December 16, 1950, except with respect to—

23 (1) purchases or contracts the aggregate amount of
24 which does not involve more than \$2,500;

1 ~~(2)~~ purchases or contracts for nonperishable sub-
2 sistence supplies;

3 ~~(3)~~ purchases or contracts for property or services
4 for experimental, developmental, or research work, or
5 making or furnishing property for experiment, test,
6 development, or research, not exceeding \$100,000.

7 ~~(4)~~ when in furtherance of small business, labor
8 surplus area, or major disaster area programs, the agency
9 head determines that supplies or services are to be pro-
10 cured from small business concerns, from concerns which
11 will perform the contracts substantially within labor
12 surplus areas as determined by the Secretary of Labor,
13 or from concerns which will perform the contracts sub-
14 stantially within areas of major disaster.

15 SEC. 413. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-
16 vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the
17 Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August
18 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing
19 shall be available for the construction of family housing at
20 any installations for which family housing is authorized to
21 be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

22 SEC. 414. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
23 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out
24 in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and insert-
25 ing in place thereof the figure "\$147,341,000".

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

*INSIDE THE UNITED STATES**TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES**(Ordnance Corps)*

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, \$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility, \$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility,
land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,417,000.

Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington: Land acquisition, \$40,000.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$110,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility, and land acquisition, \$95,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Research and development facility, \$2,496,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

1 *Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,-*
2 *000.*

3 *(Transportation Corps)*

4 *Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities,*
5 *\$1,169,000.*

6 *Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational*
7 *facilities, \$306,000.*

8 *Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop hous-*
9 *ing, and utilities, \$562,000.*

10 *(Medical Corps)*

11 *Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop*
12 *housing, \$937,000.*

13 *Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.:*
14 *Utilities, \$1,920,000.*

15 *FIELD FORCES FACILITIES*

16 *(First Army Area)*

17 *Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, main-*
18 *tenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and*
19 *utilities, \$6,719,000.*

20 *(Second Army Area)*

21 *A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop hous-*
22 *ing, \$153,000.*

23 *Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, mainte-*
24 *nance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.*

1 *Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Community facili-*
2 *ties, \$589,000.*

3 *Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.*

4 *(Third Army Area)*

5 *Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and main-*
6 *tenance facilities, \$1,583,000.*

7 *Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and mainte-*
8 *nance facilities, \$1,051,000.*

9 *Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, main-*
10 *tenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities,*
11 *\$5,117,000.*

12 *Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop*
13 *housing, \$7,549,000.*

14 *Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.*

15 *(Fourth Army Area)*

16 *Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facili-*
17 *ties, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility,*
18 *administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,*
19 *and utilities, \$7,704,000.*

20 *Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facili-*
21 *ties, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, com-*
22 *munity facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.*

23 *Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, mainte-*
24 *nance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.*

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,307,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$137,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing

1 permanent or temporary public works, including land acqui-
2 sition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equip-
3 ment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

4 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to
5 purchase out of appropriations available for military con-
6 struction family housing including necessary land at, or near,
7 military tactical installations for assignment as public
8 quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not
9 more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased
10 under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in
11 accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section
12 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations
13 as now or hereafter established for military housing con-
14 structed with appropriated funds.

15 SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress,
16 is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED
17 STATES" in section 101, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
19 TIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal,
20 Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof
21 "\$2,212,000".

22 (b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as
23 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
24 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and

1 inserting in place thereof “\$44,407,000” and “\$134,075,-
2 000”, respectively.

3 SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
4 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
5 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

6 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
7 TIES (Signal Corps)” with respect to Department of the
8 Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Mary-
9 land, strike out “\$2,360,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$3,137,000”.

11 Under the subheading “FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
12 (Military Academy)” with respect to United States Military
13 Academy, New York, strike out “\$9,950,000” and insert
14 in place thereof “\$11,983,000”.

15 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
16 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
17 tion 502 the amounts “\$129,096,000” and “\$236,060,000”
18 and inserting in place thereof “\$131,906,000” and “\$238,-
19 870,000”, respectively.

20 SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,
21 as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL
22 UNITED STATES” in section 101, as follows:

23 Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
24 TIES (Ordnance Corps)”—

25 (1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground,

1 *Maryland, strike out “\$1,736,000” and insert in place*
 2 *thereof “\$2,039,000”.*

3 *(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New*
 4 *York, strike out “\$129,000” and insert in place thereof*
 5 *“\$212,000”.*

6 *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
 7 *TIES (Quartermaster Corps)”—with respect to Fort Lee,*
 8 *Virginia, strike out “\$8,589,000” and insert in place thereof*
 9 *“\$9,874,000”.*

10 *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
 11 *TIES (Chemical Corps)”—*

12 *(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland,*
 13 *strike out “\$452,000” and insert in place thereof*
 14 *“\$525,000”.*

15 *(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground,*
 16 *Utah, strike out “\$1,129,000” and insert in place*
 17 *thereof “\$1,491,000”.*

18 *Under the subheading “TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-*
 19 *TIES (Transportation Corps)”—*

20 *(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New*
 21 *York, strike out “\$1,055,000” and insert in place*
 22 *thereof “\$1,240,000”.*

23 *(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike*
 24 *out “\$6,597,000” and insert in place thereof “\$8,-*
 25 *072,000”.*

1 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Med-
2 ical Corps)"—

3 (1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center,
4 Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof
5 "\$876,000".

6 (2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Wash-
7 ington, strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$669,000".

9 (3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical
10 Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000"
11 and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

12 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
13 (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird,
14 Maryland, strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof
15 "\$800,000".

16 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
17 (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas,
18 strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof
19 "\$14,283,000".

20 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
21 (Fifth Army Area)"—

22 (1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike
23 out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,-
24 000".

1 (2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
 2 strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof
 3 "\$9,893,000".

4 (3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike
 5 out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

6 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES
 7 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect
 8 to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert
 9 in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

10 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 11 amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CON-
 12 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

13 Under the subheading "Alaskan Area"—with respect to
 14 Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and in-
 15 sert in place thereof "\$559,000".

16 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 17 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section
 18 502 the amounts "\$225,277,000", "\$74,984,000", and
 19 "\$534,254,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$234,820,-
 20 000", "\$75,074,000", and "\$543,887,000", respectively.

21 SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress
 22 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
 23 STATES" in section 101 as follows:

1 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
2 TIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

3 (1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New
4 York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof
5 "\$136,000".

6 (2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama,
7 strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof
8 "\$8,593,000".

9 Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILI-
10 TIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—

11 (1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike
12 out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000".

13 (2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot,
14 Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place
15 thereof "\$1,847,000".

16 Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES"—

17 (1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out
18 "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000".

19 (2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out
20 "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

21 (3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas,
22 strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof
23 "\$1,373,000".

24 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as

1 amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,-
2 783,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000".

3 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of sec-
5 tion 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and
6 "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,-
7 000", "\$203,331,000", and "\$334,104,000", respectively.

8 TITLE II

9 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish
10 or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring,
11 constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing perma-
12 nent or temporary public works, including site preparation,
13 appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following
14 projects:

15 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

16 SHIPYARD FACILITIES

17 Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis,
18 Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

19 Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock
20 \$25,438,000.

21 Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
22 \$1,452,000.

23 Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for
24 remedying effects of ground subsidence, \$1,500,000.

- 1 *Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut:*
 2 *Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.*

3 *FLEET BASE FACILITIES*

- 4 *Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing,*
 5 *\$1,326,000.*

- 6 *Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront*
 7 *facilities, \$544,000.*

- 8 *Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing,*
 9 *and utilities, \$2,729,000.*

10 *AVIATION FACILITIES*

11 *(Naval Air Training Stations)*

- 12 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas:*
 13 *Operational facilities, \$566,000.*

- 14 *Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational*
 15 *facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.*

- 16 *Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities,*
 17 *\$293,000.*

- 18 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Opera-*
 19 *tional facilities (Optical landing system), \$160,000.*

- 20 *Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi:*
 21 *Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$13,-*
 22 *387,000.*

- 23 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana:*
 24 *Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities,*
 25 *\$3,653,000.*

1 *Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational*
 2 *facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition,*
 3 *\$2,713,000.*

4 *Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida:*
 5 *Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility),*
 6 *\$39,000.*

7 *(Fleet Support Air Stations)*

8 *Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational*
 9 *facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.*

10 *Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational*
 11 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational*
 13 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,089,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational*
 15 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.*

16 *Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, Cali-*
 17 *fornia: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation fa-*
 18 *cility), \$39,000.*

19 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Edenton, North Carolina:*
 20 *Operational facilities, \$160,000.*

21 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California:*
 22 *Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,310,000.*

23 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Oper-*
 24 *ational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.*

1 *Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina:*
2 *Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities,*
3 *and utilities, \$5,728,000.*

4 *Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational*
5 *facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.*

6 *Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational*
7 *facilities (Optical landing system), \$130,000.*

8 *Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational fa-*
9 *cilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$27,535,000.*

10 *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Opera-*
11 *tional facilities, \$384,000.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational*
13 *facilities, \$3,401,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational*
15 *facilities (Tactical Air Navigation facility), \$39,000.*

16 *Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California:*
17 *Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.*

18 *Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and*
19 *training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground*
20 *improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.*

21 *Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island:*
22 *Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.*

23 *Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island,*
24 *California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and*
25 *utilities, \$9,448,000.*

1 *Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington:*
2 *Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.*

3 *(Marine Corps Air Stations)*

4 *Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South*
5 *Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and*
6 *administrative facilities, \$2,632,000.*

7 *Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Caro-*
8 *lina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminis-*
9 *trative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground*
10 *improvements, \$6,503,000.*

11 *Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Opera-*
12 *tional facilities, \$3,411,000.*

13 *Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, Cali-*
14 *fornia: Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.*

15 *Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina:*
16 *Operational facilities, \$39,000.*

17 *(Special Purpose Air Stations)*

18 *Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsyl-*
19 *vania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.*

20 *Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Opera-*
21 *tional facilities, \$2,209,000.*

22 *Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California:*
23 *Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San*
24 *Nicolas Island), \$7,669,000.*

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$6,841,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$872,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, messhall, and utilities, \$1,142,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps School, Quantico, Virginia: Supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,875,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

1 *Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms,*
2 *California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, admin-*
3 *istrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,061,000.*

4 *ORDNANCE FACILITIES*

5 *Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utili-*
6 *ties, \$316,000.*

7 *Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Utilities,*
8 *\$236,000.*

9 *SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES*

10 *Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory*
11 *foundations, \$1,602,000.*

12 *Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training*
13 *facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.*

14 *Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop*
15 *housing, \$1,613,000.*

16 *COMMUNICATION FACILITIES*

17 *Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Oper-*
18 *ational facilities, \$443,000.*

19 *Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California:*
20 *Operational facilities, \$100,000.*

21 *Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California:*
22 *Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.*

23 *Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine:*
24 *Operational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.*

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities,
\$332,000.

Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities,
\$3,244,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme,
California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities,
\$759,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of
Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$1,297,000.

Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and
community facilities, and utilities, \$1,750,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands:
Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and
ground improvements, \$7,576,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, com-
munity facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Har-
bor, Oahu Territory of Hawaii: Administrative facilities and
utilities, \$332,000.

1 *Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities,*
2 *\$190,000.*

3 AVIATION FACILITIES

4 *Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands:*
5 *Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities),*
6 *\$428,000.*

7 *Naval Station, Argentina, Canada: Family housing and*
8 *community facilities, \$1,793,000.*

9 *Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of*
10 *Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas),*
11 *\$2,088,000.*

12 *Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Is-*
13 *lands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.*

14 *Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Opera-*
15 *tional facilities, \$5,730,000.*

16 : *Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Terri-*
17 *tory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.*

18 *Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Opera-*
19 *tional facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.*

20 *Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii:*
21 *Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility),*
22 *\$69,000.*

23 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Op-
24 erational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utili-
25 ties, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities, \$1,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, \$884,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Supply facilities, \$397,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities, and land acquisition, \$326,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities, \$69,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or

1 develop classified naval installations and facilities by con-
 2 structing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent
 3 or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site
 4 preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the
 5 total amount of \$59,056,000.

6 SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Con-
 7 gress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CON-
 8 TINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

9 Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
 10 TIES", with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,-
 11 500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

12 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
 13 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "\$86,-
 14 397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

15 (c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as
 16 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 17 tion 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000",
 18 and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place
 19 thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,-
 20 927,000".

21 SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,
 22 as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL
 23 UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

24 Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with
 25 respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, Cali-

1 *fornia, strike out “\$225,000” and insert in place thereof*
 2 *“\$369,000”; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station,*
 3 *El Toro, California, strike out “\$1,675,000” and insert in*
 4 *place thereof “\$2,030,000”; and with respect to the Naval*
 5 *Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out “\$70,000” and*
 6 *insert in place thereof “\$170,000”.*

7 *(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as*
 8 *amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, “\$63,-*
 9 *358,000” and inserting in place thereof “\$70,656,000”.*

10 *(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as*
 11 *amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section*
 12 *502 the amounts “\$102,956,000”, “\$63,358,000”, “\$202,-*
 13 *807,000” and inserting respectively in place thereof “\$103,-*
 14 *555,000”, “\$70,656,000”, and “\$210,704,000”.*

15 *SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress,*
 16 *as amended, is amended under the heading “CONTINENTAL*
 17 *UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:*

18 *(1) Under the subheading “SHIPYARD FACILITIES”,*
 19 *with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Cali-*
 20 *fornia, strike out “\$629,000” and insert in place thereof*
 21 *“\$1,099,000”.*

22 *(2) Under the subheading “FLEET BASE FACILITIES”,*
 23 *with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out*
 24 *“\$399,000” and insert in place thereof “\$563,000”.*

25 *(3) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES*

1 (*Naval Air Training Stations*)", with respect to the Naval
 2 *Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas*, strike out "\$3,686,-
 3 000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with
 4 respect to the *Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia,*
 5 *Louisiana*, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place
 6 thereof "\$26,871,000".

7 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
 8 (*Fleet Support Air Stations*)", with respect to the Naval
 9 *Air Station, Alameda, California*, strike out "\$3,729,000"
 10 and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to
 11 the *Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California*, strike out
 12 "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000";
 13 and with respect to the *Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field,*
 14 *Duval County, Florida*, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert
 15 in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

16 (5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
 17 (*Special Purpose Air Stations*)", with respect to the Naval
 18 *Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey*, strike out "\$16,311,-
 19 000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

20 (6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES",
 21 with respect to the *Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory,*
 22 *Daingerfield, Texas*, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in
 23 place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the *Naval*
 24 *Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California*, strike out
 25 "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

1 (7) Under the subheading “SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
 2 TIES” with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian
 3 Head, Maryland, strike out “\$780,000” and insert in place
 4 thereof “\$879,000”.

5 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 6 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CONTI-
 7 NENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 201 as follows:

8 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”
 9 with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajelein, Marshall
 10 Islands, strike out “\$4,411,000” and insert in place thereof
 11 “\$5,235,000”.

12 (2) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATION FACILI-
 13 TIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Facility,
 14 Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out “\$2,848,600” and
 15 insert in place thereof “\$3,198,600”.

16 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 17 amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 “\$151,-
 18 342,400” and inserting in place thereof “\$152,763,400”.

19 (d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
 20 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of sec-
 21 tion 502 the amounts “\$299,512,600”, “\$107,191,300”,
 22 “\$151,342,400”, and “\$564,046,300” and inserting re-
 23 spectively in place thereof “\$308,463,600”, “\$108,365,300”,
 24 “\$152,763,400”, and “\$575,592,300”.

25 SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress,

1 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED
2 STATES" in section 201, as follows:

3 (1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES"
4 with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Caro-
5 lina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof
6 "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long
7 Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in
8 place thereof "\$8,169,000".

9 (2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES",
10 with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California,
11 strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,-
12 623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk,
13 Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof
14 "\$3,340,000".

15 (3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
16 (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
17 Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000"
18 and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

19 (4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES
20 (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval
21 Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out
22 "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

23 (5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILI-
24 TIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Mary-

1 land, strike out “\$7,469,000” and insert in place thereof
2 “\$10,919,000”.

3 (6) Under the subheading “COMMUNICATIONS FACIL-
4 ITIES”, with respect to the Naval Communication Station,
5 San Francisco, California, strike out “\$2,029,000” and in-
6 sert in place thereof “\$3,779,000”.

7 (7) Under the subheading “YARDS AND DOCKS FACILI-
8 TIES”, with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk,
9 Virginia, strike out “\$443,000” and insert in place thereof
10 “\$500,000”.

11 (b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
12 amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED
13 STATES” in section 201, as follows:

14 (1) Under the subheading “AVIATION FACILITIES”,
15 with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike
16 out “\$1,961,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,337,000”.

17 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
18 amended by striking out in section 203, “\$84,043,000” and
19 inserting in place thereof “\$85,939,000”.

20 (d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is
21 amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the
22 amounts “\$292,572,000”, “\$61,625,000”, “\$84,043,000”,
23 and “\$438,240,000” and inserting respectively in place
24 thereof “\$303,453,000”, “\$62,001,000”, “\$85,939,000”,
25 and “\$451,393,000”.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. *The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:*

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North

1 *Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance fa-*
2 *cilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community*
3 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.*

4 *Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri:*
5 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
6 *supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facili-*
7 *ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,100,000.*

8 *Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California:*
9 *Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utili-*
10 *ties and ground improvements, \$614,000.*

11 *Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan:*
12 *Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and*
13 *ground improvements, \$429,000.*

14 *K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan:*
15 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
16 *community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
17 *\$905,000.*

18 *Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Ore-*
19 *gon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,*
20 *community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
21 *\$1,299,000.*

22 *McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Opera-*
23 *tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities*
24 *and ground improvements, \$632,000.*

1 *McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply*
2 *facilities and community facilities, \$189,000.*

3 *Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Opera-*
4 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
5 *facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facili-*
6 *ties, community facilities, and utilities and ground improve-*
7 *ments, \$6,804,000.*

8 *Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New*
9 *York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities*
10 *and ground improvements, \$281,000.*

11 *Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Family*
12 *housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$559,000.*

13 *Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Mainte-*
14 *nance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities,*
15 *troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,-*
16 *828,000.*

17 *Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon:*
18 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
19 *supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
20 *\$3,768,000.*

21 *Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine:*
22 *Community facilities, \$244,000.*

23 *Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin:*
24 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utili-*
25 *ties and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.*

1 *Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan:*
2 *Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*
3 *utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.*

4 *Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Opera-*
5 *tional and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.*

6 *Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply*
7 *facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-*
8 *ments, and real estate improvement, \$694,000.*

9 *Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach,*
10 *New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utili-*
11 *ties and ground improvements, \$956,000.*

12 *Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Utilities and ground*
13 *improvements and land acquisition, \$130,000.*

14 *Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Main-*
15 *tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community*
16 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.*

17 *Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Opera-*
18 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
19 *facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improve-*
20 *ments, \$2,153,000.*

21 *Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio:*
22 *Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
23 *\$217,000.*

24 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
25 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-*

1 ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community
 2 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land ac-
 3 sition, \$44,428,000.

4 AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

5 Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational
 6 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, de-
 7 velopment, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative
 8 facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements,
 9 and land acquisition, \$10,410,000.

10 Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and
 11 training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

12 Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Mainte-
 13 nance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
 14 \$899,000.

15 McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California:
 16 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
 17 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
 18 improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,912,000.

19 Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania:
 20 Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

21 Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational
 22 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
 23 troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground
 24 improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,354,000.

1 *Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota:*

2 *Community facilities, \$56,000.*

3 *Tinker Air Force Base: Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:*

4 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop*

5 *housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.*

6 *Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio:*

7 *Operational and training facilities, research, development,*

8 *and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities,*

9 *utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition,*

10 *\$1,777,000.*

11 *AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND*

12 *Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research*

13 *development, and test facilities, troop housing, community*

14 *facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land*

15 *acquisition, \$5,826,000.*

16 *AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND*

17 *Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Opera-*

18 *tional and training facilities, research, development, and test*

19 *facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground im-*

20 *provements, \$1,987,000.*

21 *Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico:*

22 *Operational and training facilities, research, development,*

23 *and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*

24 *utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.*

1 *Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Ne-*
 2 *vada: Community facilities, \$206,000.*

3 *Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico:*
 4 *Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*
 5 *utilities and ground improvements, \$2,276,000.*

6 *Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts:*
 7 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
 8 *research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities,*
 9 *community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and*
 10 *land acquisition, \$3,469,000.*

11 *Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational*
 12 *and training facilities, research, development, and test facili-*
 13 *ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground*
 14 *improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,882,000.*

15 *AIR TRAINING COMMAND*

16 *Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational*
 17 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
 18 *ties, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements,*
 19 *and land acquisition, \$2,872,000.*

20 *Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational*
 21 *and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.*

22 *Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Com-*
 23 *munity facilities, \$262,000.*

24 *Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational*

1 and training facilities, troop housing, and community facili-
2 ties, \$2,209,000.

3 Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance
4 facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and
5 ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,848,000.

6 Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Opera-
7 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
8 facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land
9 acquisition, \$8,249,000.

10 McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop
11 housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improve-
12 ments, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

13 Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational
14 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-
15 ties, and community facilities, \$938,000.

16 Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community
17 facilities, \$436,000.

18 Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational
19 and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

20 Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities
22 and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

23 Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational
24 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
25 \$5,909,000.

1 *Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community*
2 *facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition,*
3 *and real estate improvements, \$900,000.*

4 *Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Opera-*
5 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
6 *facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements,*
7 *\$4,200,000.*

8 *Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing,*
9 *and community facilities, \$1,945,000.*

10 Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational
11 and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition,
12 \$1,977,000.

13 Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational
14 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,
15 community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements.
16 \$4,118,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$865,000.

20 AIR UNIVERSITY

21 *Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land*
22 *acquisition, \$50,000.*

23 CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

24 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical
25 facilities, \$952,000.

1 *Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Opera-*
 2 *tional and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.*

3 *Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utili-*
 4 *ties and ground improvements, and land acquisition,*
 5 *\$337,000.*

6 *MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE*

7 *Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis,*
 8 *Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.*

9 *Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland:*
 10 *Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.*

11 *Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Caro-*
 12 *lina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improve-*
 13 *ments, \$2,216,000.*

14 *Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Troop hous-*
 15 *ing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$745,000.*

16 *McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey:*
 17 *Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements,*
 18 *and land acquisition, \$496,000.*

19 *STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND*

20 *Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational*
 21 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community*
 22 *facilities, \$848,000.*

23 *Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana:*
 24 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*

1 supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities,
2 \$3,344,000.

3 Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Opera-
4 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
5 facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,458,000.

6 Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational
7 and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply
8 facilities, \$1,487,000.

9 Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational
10 and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing,
11 \$5,557,000.

12 Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas:
13 Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,
14 supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and
15 land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

16 Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Opera-
17 tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply
18 facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and
19 land acquisition, \$8,966,000.

20 Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Opera-
21 tional and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing,
22 land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

23 Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance
24 facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground

1 improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improve-
2 ments, \$2,076,000.

3 *Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma:*
4 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-*
5 *munity facilities, \$536,000.*

6 *Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Op-*
7 *erational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
8 *facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, and ground*
9 *improvements, \$2,320,000.*

10 *Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Main-*
11 *tenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community*
12 *facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,361,000.*

13 *Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and*
14 *training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,*
15 *community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and*
16 *land acquisition, \$14,638,000.*

17 *Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community*
18 *facilities, \$100,000.*

19 *Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota:*
20 *Operational and training facilities and supply facilities,*
21 *\$1,976,000.*

22 *Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Op-*
23 *erational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.*

24 *Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational*
25 *and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.*

1 *Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facili-*
2 *ties, \$34,000.*

3 *Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi:*
4 *Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities,*
5 *supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.*

6 *Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Main-*
7 *tenance facilities, \$380,000.*

8 *Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop*
9 *housing and community facilities, \$994,000.*

10 *Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana:*
11 *Real estate improvements, \$179,000.*

12 *Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington:*
13 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and com-*
14 *munity facilities, \$12,552,000.*

15 *Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational*
16 *and training facilities, \$250,000.*

17 *Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land*
18 *acquisition, \$37,000.*

19 *Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Oper-*
20 *ational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities*
21 *and ground improvements, \$1,504,000.*

22 *Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational*
23 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
24 *ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.*

1 *MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational*
2 *and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and*
3 *ground improvements, \$936,000.*

4 *Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana:*
5 *Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and*
6 *utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.*

7 *March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Opera-*
8 *tional and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.*

9 *Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home,*
10 *Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community*
11 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.*

12 *Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational*
13 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
14 *ties, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground*
15 *improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.*

16 *Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York:*
17 *Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
18 *\$231,000.*

19 *Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hamp-*
20 *shire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and*
21 *ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.*

22 *Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Community*
23 *facilities, \$372,000.*

24 *Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Opera-*
25 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, com-*

1 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$1,937,000.

3 *Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational*
4 *and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facili-*
5 *ties, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.*

6 *Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Opera-*
7 *tional and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply*
8 *facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community*
9 *facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,676,000.*

10 *Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachu-*
11 *setts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, com-*
12 *munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
13 *\$1,901,000.*

14 *Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Opera-*
15 *tional and training facilities, and community facilities,*
16 *\$235,000.*

17 *TACTICAL AIR COMMAND*

18 *Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Mainte-*
19 *nance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing,*
20 *community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and*
21 *land acquisition, \$2,149,000.*

22 *Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Caro-*
23 *lina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and*
24 *community facilities, \$1,287,000.*

25 *England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana:*

1 Troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition,
2 \$1,558,000.

3 Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community
4 facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land ac-
5 quisition, \$683,000.

6 George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Sup-
7 ply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

8 Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Utilities
9 and ground improvements, \$20,000.

10 Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South
11 Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community
12 facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements,
13 \$1,204,000.

14 Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community
15 facilities, \$484,000.

16 Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North
17 Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance
18 facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, commu-
19 nity facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acqui-
20 sition, and real estate improvements, \$9,991,000.

21 Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop
22 housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

23 SPECIAL FACILITIES

24 Various locations: Operational and training facilities,
25 \$229,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$4,742,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$11,500,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$247,000.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,228,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-

1 munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,
2 \$7,569,000.

3 *MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE*

4 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
5 *supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and*
6 *utilities and ground improvements, \$14,741,000.*

7 *STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND*

8 *Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities,*
9 *\$820,000.*

10 *Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and*
11 *training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground*
12 *improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.*

13 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
14 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, com-*
15 *munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
16 *\$57,218,000.*

17 *UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE*

18 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
19 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-*
20 *ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community*
21 *facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate*
22 *improvements, \$36,057,000.*

23 *SPECIAL FACILITIES*

24 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
25 *\$170,000.*

1 *AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM*

2 *Various locations: Operational and training facilities,*
3 *maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facili-*
4 *ties, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, com-*
5 *munity facilities, and utilities and ground improvements,*
6 *\$20,000,000.*

7 *SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish*
8 *or develop classified military installations and facilities by*
9 *acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or in-*
10 *stalling permanent or temporary public works, including land*
11 *acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and*
12 *equipment in the total amount of \$47,000,000.*

13 *SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress,*
14 *as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL*
15 *UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:*

16 *Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with*
17 *respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, Cali-*
18 *fornia, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof*
19 *"\$584,000".*

20 *Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—*
21 *with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Okla-*
22 *homa, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof*
23 *"\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in*
24 *place thereof "\$2,756,000".*

25 *Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COM-*

1 MAND"—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hemp-
 2 stead, New York, strike out "\$729,000" and insert in place
 3 thereof "\$929,000"; and strike out "\$686,000" and insert
 4 in place thereof "\$886,000".

5 Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
 6 COMMAND"—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
 7 Muroc, California, strike out "\$27,478,000" and insert in
 8 place thereof "\$29,442,000"; and strike out "\$16,192,000"
 9 and insert in place thereof "\$18,156,000".

10 (b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as
 11 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
 12 tion 502 so much as reads "\$406,120,000" and "\$415,-
 13 949,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$409,937,000" and
 14 "\$419,766,000", respectively.

15 SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Con-
 16 gress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTI-
 17 NENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

18 Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

19 (1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
 20 ington, strike out "\$1,716,000" and insert in place
 21 thereof \$2,717,000";

22 (2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Da-
 23 kota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof
 24 "\$9,220,000";

25 (3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault

1 *Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,029,000 and in-*
 2 *sert in place thereof “\$2,195,000”;*

3 (4) *with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike*
 4 *out “\$6,603,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,268,-*
 5 *000”;*

6 (5) *with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Ox-*
 7 *nard, California, strike out “\$2,445,000” and insert in*
 8 *place thereof “\$2,935,000”;*

9 (6) *with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base,*
 10 *Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out “\$5,526,000” and*
 11 *insert in place thereof “\$6,445,000”;*

12 (7) *with respect to Youngstown Municipal Air-*
 13 *port, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out “\$742,000” and*
 14 *insert in place thereof “\$893,000”;*

15 (8) *with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma,*
 16 *Arizona, strike out “\$2,107,000” and insert in place*
 17 *thereof “\$2,676,000”.*

18 *Under the subheading “AIR MATERIEL COMMAND”—*

19 (1) *with respect to Brookley Air Force Base,*
 20 *Mobile, Alabama, strike out “\$4,170,000” and insert*
 21 *in place thereof “\$4,728,000”;*

22 (2) *with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome,*
 23 *New York, strike out “\$15,803,000” and insert in*
 24 *place thereof “\$16,654,000”;*

25 (3) *with respect to McClellan Air Force Base,*

1 *Sacramento, California, strike out “\$9,522,000” and*
2 *insert in place thereof “\$11,970,000”;*

3 (4) *with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force*
4 *Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out “\$12,001,000” and*
5 *insert in place thereof “\$14,508,000”.*

6 *Under the subheading “AIR TRAINING COMMAND”—*

7 (1) *with respect to Ellington Air Force Base,*
8 *Houston, Texas, strike out “\$3,438,000” and insert*
9 *in place thereof “\$3,876,000”;*

10 (2) *with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base,*
11 *San Angelo, Texas, strike out “\$4,081,000” and insert*
12 *in place thereof “\$5,088,000”;*

13 (3) *with respect to Greenville Air Force Base,*
14 *Greenville, Mississippi, strike out “\$500,000” and insert*
15 *in place thereof “\$545,000”;*

16 (4) *with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base,*
17 *Harlingen, Texas, strike out “\$446,000” and insert*
18 *in place thereof “\$529,000”;*

19 (5) *with respect to James Connally Air Force*
20 *Base, Waco, Texas, strike out “\$883,000” and insert*
21 *in place thereof “\$1,129,000”;*

22 (6) *with respect to Mather Air Force Base,*
23 *Sacramento, California, strike out “\$1,516,000” and*
24 *insert in place thereof “\$1,998,000”;*

25 (7) *with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lub-*

bock, Texas, strike out “\$1,076,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,304,000”;

(8) with respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out “\$1,215,000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,556,000”.

Under the subheading “HEADQUARTERS COMMAND”—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, strike out “\$520,000” and insert in place thereof “\$825,000”.

Under the subheading “RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND”—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada, strike out “\$555,500” and insert in place thereof “\$624,500”.

Under the subheading “STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND”—

(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, strike out “\$5,929,000” and insert in place thereof “\$7,363,000”;

(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out “\$11,155,000” and insert in place thereof “\$12,218,000”;

(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out “\$9,769,000” and insert in place thereof “\$11,473,000”;

(4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Ros-

1 well, New Mexico, strike out “\$6,657,000” and insert
2 in place thereof “\$8,324,000”.

3 Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—

4 (1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base,
5 Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out “\$2,684,000” and
6 insert in place thereof “\$3,527,000”;

7 (2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base,
8 Peru, Indiana, strike out “\$559,000” and insert in place
9 thereof “\$611,000”;

10 (3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victor-
11 ville, California, strike out “\$1,598,000” and insert in
12 place thereof “\$1,905,000”;

13 (4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses
14 Lake, Washington, strike out “\$4,724,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$5,197,000”;

16 (5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base,
17 Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out “\$3,589,000” and insert
18 in place thereof “\$4,010,000”.

19 (b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
20 amended, is amended under the heading “OUTSIDE CON-
21 TINENTAL UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

22 Under the subheading “ALASKAN AIR COMMAND”—
23 with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out “\$518,000” and
24 insert in place thereof “\$735,000”.

25 Under the subheading “AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL

1 AIDS”—with respect to various locations, strike out “\$526,-
2 000” and insert in place thereof “\$1,394,000”.

3 (c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as
4 amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of sec-
5 tion 502 the amounts “\$801,256,000”, “\$532,454,000”,
6 and “\$1,339,060,000” and inserting in place thereof
7 “\$824,300,000”, “\$533,539,000”, and “\$1,363,189,000”,
8 respectively.

9 SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Con-
10 gress, is amended, under the heading “CONTINENTAL
11 UNITED STATES” in section 301, as follows:

12 Under the subheading “AIR DEFENSE COMMAND”—

13 (1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport,
14 Duluth, Minnesota, strike out “\$863,000” and insert
15 in place thereof “\$1,469,000”;

16 (2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash-
17 ington, strike out “\$2,827,000” and insert in place
18 thereof “\$3,079,000”;

19 (3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base,
20 Glasgow, Montana, strike out “\$2,470,000” and insert
21 in place thereof “\$3,080,000”;

22 (4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base,
23 Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out “\$18,969,000”
24 and insert in place thereof “\$30,521,000”;

25 (5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base,

1 *Kansas City, Missouri, strike out “\$1,673,000” and in-*
2 *sert in place thereof “\$1,781,000”;*

3 *(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault*
4 *Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out “\$2,156,000” and*
5 *insert in place thereof “\$2,336,000”;*

6 *(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Air-*
7 *port, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out “\$1,130,000”*
8 *and insert in place thereof “\$1,560,000”;*

9 *(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot,*
10 *North Dakota, strike out “\$21,215,000” and insert in*
11 *place thereof “\$27,035,000”;*

12 *(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Air-*
13 *port, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out “\$3,030,000”*
14 *and insert in place thereof “\$3,409,000”;*

15 *(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base,*
16 *Camarillo, California, strike out “\$2,392,000” and in-*
17 *sert in place thereof “\$2,779,000”;*

18 *(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport,*
19 *Sioux City, Iowa, strike out “\$2,288,000” and insert*
20 *in place thereof “\$2,900,000”;*

21 *(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wis-*
22 *consin, strike out “\$4,876,000” and insert in place*
23 *thereof “\$8,726,000”;*

24 *(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base,*

Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "\$3,278,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,808,000";

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out "\$21,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,201,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out "\$17,966,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,005,000";

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out "\$473,000" and insert in place thereof "\$745,000";

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$251,000";

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out "\$5,990,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,763,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out "\$17,121,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,471,000";

(2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,000";

(3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

(4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,063,000";

(5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,064,000".

Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY"—with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

(2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place thereof, "\$500,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,939,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,530,000";

1 (2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base,
2 Muroc, California, strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert
3 in place thereof "\$7,220,000".

4 Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

5 (1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso,
6 Texas, strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof
7 "\$1,190,000";

8 (2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced,
9 California, strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place
10 thereof "\$2,643,000";

11 (3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base,
12 Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "\$14,518,000" and
13 insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";

14 (4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base,
15 Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out "\$943,000" and
16 insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";

17 (5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base,
18 Homestead, Florida, strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert
19 in place thereof "\$1,966,000";

20 (6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base,
21 Columbus, Ohio, strike out "\$4,952,000" and insert in
22 place thereof "\$7,880,000";

23 (7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base,

1 *Great Falls, Montana, strike out “\$1,236,000” and*
 2 *insert in place thereof “\$1,586,000”;*

3 *(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force*
 4 *Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out “\$2,064,000”*
 5 *and insert in place thereof “\$2,607,000”;*

6 *(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha,*
 7 *Nebraska, strike out “\$5,697,000” and insert in place*
 8 *thereof “\$6,155,000”;*

9 *(10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base,*
 10 *Plattsburgh, New York, strike out “\$1,491,000” and*
 11 *insert in place thereof “\$2,027,000”;*

12 *(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base,*
 13 *Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out “\$661,000”*
 14 *and insert in place thereof “\$720,000”;*

15 *(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base,*
 16 *Roswell, New Mexico, strike out “\$2,791,000” and*
 17 *insert in place thereof “\$3,181,000”.*

18 *Under the subheading “TACTICAL AIR COMMAND”—*
 19 *with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia,*
 20 *strike out “\$2,613,000” and insert in place thereof “\$2,785,-*
 21 *000”.*

22 *(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is*
 23 *amended under the heading “OUTSIDE THE UNITED*
 24 *STATES” as follows:*

1 Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—
2 with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000"
3 and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

4 (c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is
5 amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the
6 amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,-
7 934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000",
8 "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

9 SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act
10 of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to
11 read as follows:

12 "(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceed-
13 ing with construction made necessary by changes in Air
14 Force missions, new weapons developments, new and un-
15 foreseen research and development requirements, or im-
16 proved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense
17 determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion
18 in the next military construction authorization Act would
19 be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in
20 connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabili-
21 tate, or install permanent or temporary public works, includ-
22 ing land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-
23 ities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000:
24 Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his desig-
25 nee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the

1 *Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon*
2 *reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of con-*
3 *struction of any public work undertaken under this subsec-*
4 *tion, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."*

5 *TITLE IV—FAMILY HOUSING*

6 *SEC. 401. Any outstanding authority heretofore pro-*
7 *vided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the*
8 *Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August*
9 *3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing*
10 *shall be available for the construction of family housing at*
11 *any installations for which family housing is authorized to*
12 *be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.*

13 *SEC. 402. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69*
14 *Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read*
15 *as follows:*

16 *"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and*
17 *1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force,*
18 *respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or*
19 *near military tactical installations for assignment as public*
20 *quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any,*
21 *without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary*
22 *of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate*
23 *housing facilities at or near such military tactical installa-*

1 tions. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or
2 individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such
3 units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for
4 the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of ap-
5 propriations available for maintenance and operation but
6 may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit.”

7 SEC. 403. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under
8 the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of Septem-
9 ber 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net
10 floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections
11 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

12 (b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68
13 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

14 SEC. 404. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as
15 follows:

16 (a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following
17 new subsection at the end thereof:

18 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
19 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
20 the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
21 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

22 (b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following
23 new subsection at the end thereof:

24 “(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters

1 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members
2 of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor
3 area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

4 (c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following
5 new subsection at the end thereof:

6 “(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters
7 constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of
8 the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net
9 floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

10 SEC. 405. The second paragraph of section 407 of the
11 Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as
12 amended, is further amended to read as follows:

13 “The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity
14 Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available
15 for the payment of quarters allowances for military per-
16 sonnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges
17 for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allow-
18 ances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental
19 charges collected from personnel occupying any housing
20 constructed or acquired under authority of this section after
21 deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and
22 operation of such housing: Provided, That such payments
23 shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the
24 foreign currencies used for all such construction or
25 acquisition.”

1 *SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any*
2 *other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family hous-*
3 *ing units shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support*
4 *of military installations or activities unless the actual num-*
5 *ber of units involved has been specifically authorized by*
6 *an annual military construction authorization act.*

7 *(b) Effective July 1, 1958, the provisions of sec-*
8 *tion 419, Public Law 968, Eighty-fifth Congress, second*
9 *session, are hereby repealed.*

10 *SEC. 407. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any*
11 *other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine*
12 *Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Pub-*
13 *lic Health Service, may occupy on a rental basis, without*
14 *loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate quarters*
15 *under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services, not-*
16 *withstanding that such quarters may have been constructed*
17 *or converted for assignment as public quarters.*

18 *(b) The provisions of this section shall be administered*
19 *under regulations approved by the President.*

20 *(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air*
21 *Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary*
22 *of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is*
23 *operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Sec-*
24 *retary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and*
25 *the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the*

1 *Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the "Sec-*
 2 *retaries")*, are each authorized, subject to standards estab-
 3 *lished pursuant to (a) above, to designate as rental housing*
 4 *such housing as he may determine to be inadequate as public*
 5 *quarters.*

6 *(d) The Secretaries are each further authorized, sub-*
 7 *ject to standards established pursuant to subsection (a)*
 8 *above, to lease inadequate housing to personnel of any of the*
 9 *mentioned services for occupancy by them. The housing*
 10 *facilities leased, as herein provided, shall not be required*
 11 *to have been constructed with funds derived from appro-*
 12 *priations specifically made for the purpose of the construc-*
 13 *tion of rental housing for personnel of the services mentioned.*

14 *TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS*

15 *SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department*
 16 *may proceed to establish or develop installations and facili-*
 17 *ties under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and*
 18 *3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections*
 19 *4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code.*
 20 *The authority to place permanent or temporary improve-*
 21 *ments on land includes authority for surveys, administration,*
 22 *overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construc-*
 23 *tion. That authority may be exercised before title to the*
 24 *land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes,*
 25 *as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily.*

1 *The authority to acquire real estate or land includes au-*
2 *thority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests*
3 *in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, ex-*
4 *change of Government-owned land, or otherwise.*

5 *SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such*
6 *sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but*
7 *appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles*
8 *I, II, and III shall not exceed—*

9 *(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$114,-*
10 *949,000; outside the United States, \$34,477,000; sec-*
11 *tion 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$292,428,000;*

12 *(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$216,-*
13 *175,000; outside the United States, \$47,695,000; sec-*
14 *tion 202, \$59,056,000; or a total of \$322,926,000;*
15 *and*

16 *(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$380,-*
17 *354,000; outside the United States, \$160,705,000; sec-*
18 *tion 302, \$47,000,000; or a total of \$588,059,000.*

19 *SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or*
20 *III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary con-*
21 *cerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the*
22 *United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside*
23 *the United States. However, the total cost of all projects*
24 *in each such title may not be more than the total amount*
25 *authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.*

1 *SEC. 504. Whenever—*

2 *(1) the President determines that compliance with*
3 *section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for*
4 *contracts made under this Act for the establishment*
5 *or development of military installations and facilities in*
6 *foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out*
7 *of this Act; and*

8 *(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller*
9 *General have agreed upon alternative methods for ade-*
10 *quately auditing those contracts;*
11 *the President may exempt those contracts from the require-*
12 *ments of that section.*

13 *SEC. 505. Contracts made by the United States under*
14 *this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a com-*
15 *petitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the*
16 *national security will not be impaired and the award is con-*
17 *sistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code,*
18 *and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547,*
19 *551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall*
20 *report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the*
21 *Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to*
22 *all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to*
23 *the lowest responsible bidder.*

24 *SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for*
25 *military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary*

1 of a military department in connection with the establish-
2 ment or development of military installations and facilities,
3 and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are
4 contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and
5 not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authoriza-
6 tion are repealed, except—

7 (1) authorizations for public works and for appro-
8 priations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the
9 titles that contain the general provisions;

10 (2) the authorization for public works projects as
11 to which appropriated funds have been obligated for
12 construction contracts in whole or in part before July
13 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

14 (3) the authorizations for public works and the
15 appropriation of funds that are contained in sections
16 2231-2238 of title 10 United States Code, as amended
17 (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

18 (4) the authorization for the development of the
19 Line of Communications, France, in the amount of
20 \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of
21 Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

22 (5) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410
23 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016),
24 the authorization for (a) development of classified fa-
25 cilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in

1 title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951
2 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified
3 facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained
4 in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952
5 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

6 (6) the authorization for public works and for the
7 appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act
8 of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

9 SEC. 507. None of the authority contained in titles I,
10 II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorized any
11 building construction project within the continental United
12 States at an average nationwide unit cost in excess of—

13 (a) \$28 per square foot for cold-storage ware-
14 housing;

15 (b) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

16 (c) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

17 (d) \$7,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters,
18 unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of
19 special circumstances, application to such project of the
20 limitation on unit costs contained in this section is imprac-
21 ticable.

22 SEC. 508. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as
23 amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out

- 1 *in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and insert-*
- 2 *ing in place thereof the figure "\$135,425,000".*

Passed the House of Representatives July 10, 1957.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with an amendment August 12, 1957.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8240

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 12, 1957

Ordered to be printed with the amendment of the
Senate

Aug. 13, 1957

16. PERSONNEL. Received from GSA a proposed bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as "to provide for training of employees"; to Government Operations Committee. p. 13283
Rep. Davis, Ga., called for a reduction in the number of Federal employees and a greater utilization of manpower. p. 13223
17. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries (p. 13227). Senate conferees have *NOT* been appointed.
18. INFORMATION. A further conference was requested with the Senate on H.R. 4813, to extend the life of the D. C. Auditorium Commission. p. 13227
19. HOUSING. Agreed to the Senate amendments, with an amendment, to H.R. 4602, to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns. pp. 13227-28
20. POSTAL RATES. Passed, with amendments, 256 to 129, H.R. 5836, to increase postal rates. pp. 13237-72
21. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Rogers inserted several letters urging drought relief for Mass.. pp. 13272-73
22. INFLATION. Rep. Vursell urged that action be taken to curb inflation. pp. 13274-75

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Neuberger inserted a letter from the Ore. Director of Agriculture discussing marketing problems, and a statement by an onion farmer before the Senate Subcommittee holding hearings on onion futures trading. pp. A6571-2
Extension of remarks of Rep. Judd on a questionnaire answered by his constituents showing their concern over the budget and with 78% opposing any greater financial assistance to farmers. pp. A6595-7
Rep. Moulder inserted the summary of a questionnaire to his constituents, in which 67% favored a balanced budget over tax cuts, 61% opposed the soil bank program, 52% did not favor the "Eisenhower administration" of the program, and 52% opposed the foreign aid program. p. A6605
24. GRAIN SORGHUM. Rep. Rogers, Tex., inserted a statement by the Grain Sorghum Producers Ass'n to the recent meeting of commodity groups, urging equal-level price supports, soil banking of "cultivated acres" by value of the land instead of type of crops, treating of all feed grains alike, and a limitation of planting to 85% of the total cultivated acreage. pp. A6610-11
25. COTTON. Rep. Elliott inserted an editorial, "The Cotton Problem," quoting the Life magazine editorial on the farm problem and stating, "The Tribune is for subsidizing the small cotton farmer. . ." p. A6619
26. SURPLUS FOODS. Sen. Wiley inserted a speech by Sen. Humphrey to the board of directors of CARE in which he pointed to the uses of surplus production of foods, urged a greater use of these surpluses, and stated that foreign officials knew more about Public Law 480 than our ambassadors, because of the vital importance of the program to them. pp. A6566-70

27. RICE; FISH. Sen. Fulbright inserted an article "Fish Can Prepare Seedbed, England Rice Farmer Finds," stating that fish often do a better job than plows and disks in preparing rice seedbeds for sowing. p. A6566
28. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Johnson inserted an editorial supporting his program for water resource development in Texas. p. A6561
29. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Yarborough inserted his remarks before the Appropriations Committee on the problems created in Texas by the long continued drought. pp. A6564-5
30. ROADS. Sen. Bush inserted an editorial urging action on the billboard bill. p. A6570
Sen. Humphrey inserted an article, "How to Wreck a Road," urging/positive program of roadside protection planning. pp. A6576-7
31. STATEHOOD. Del. Burns inserted 5 editorials favoring statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. pp. A6575-6
32. FEDERAL AID. Rep. Lane inserted an article, "Unfair Drain," opposing federal aid on the grounds that Mass. pays much more in taxes than it received in benefits. pp. A6577-8
33. BUDGETING. Rep. Cannon inserted a letter from 38 members of the House Appropriations Committee opposing enactment of H.R. 8002, the accrued expenditures bill, on the ground that needed contract authorities would be far more delusive than the present system. p. A6580
34. RECLAMATION. Rep. Aspinall inserted a paper by the Chief, Economics and Statistics Div. of Irrigation, Bureau of Reclamation, defending irrigated lands from charges that they contribute to surplus problems, and declaring that irrigated cotton was the largest problem, producing 5% of the total supply. pp. A6581-3
Extension of remarks of Rep. Miller, Nebr., opposing deletion of the sums budgeted for the Ainsworth and Farwell Irrigation Districts, Nebr.. pp. A6620-1
35. ELECTRIFICATION; PERSONNEL. Rep. Alger inserted his weekly newsletter, in which he criticized additional appropriation for TVA and declared he opposed an 11% pay raise while supporting a 7½% increase. pp. A6585-6
36. T.V.A. Rep. Baker inserted an editorial, "TVA Area Could be Blighted if Action to Finance Power Production Should Be Much More Delayed by Congress." p. A6588
37. NOMINATIONS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell opposing the nomination of Jerome K. Kuykendall to the Federal Power Commission and inserting a letter from five Representatives opposing the nomination. pp. A6599-A6601
38. ATOMIC ENERGY. Rep. Meader inserted an editorial opposing what it termed effort to "put the Government headlong into the atomic energy development field." p. A6601
Rep. Meader inserted an editorial stating that opposition to the proposed Monroe, Mich., private firm power reactor, stemmed from Federal power advocates who wanted Federal development of atomic energy power. p. A6604

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WALTER objected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 6127) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Speaker recognize me to move to send the bill to the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not. It is not necessary to do that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Speaker advise what action is necessary now in order to get the bill to the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. Anyone can make the request of the chairman of the Committee on Rules to call a meeting of the committee to consider the whole matter.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if that were done, would the bill which is now on the Speaker's desk be before the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. It would not be before the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules could consider the matter of what procedure to recommend to the House for the disposition of this whole matter.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the request of the gentleman?

Mr. VINSON. To send the military installations construction bill to conference. I spoke to the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] about that this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS of Louisiana, KILDAY, DURHAM, RIVERS, ARENDS, COLE, GAVIN, and NORBLAD.

STADIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1937) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, HARRIS, TEAGUE of Texas, SIMPSON of Illinois, and O'HARA of Minnesota.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4813) to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments and request a further conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORRISON, MULTER, GRANAHAH, KEARNS, and BROYHILL.

AMENDING TITLE III OF THE SERVICEMEN'S AND VETERANS' SURVIVOR BENEFITS ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9117) to amend title III of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act to provide for payment of the death gratuity in certain cases involving deaths after June 27, 1950, and before January 1, 1957, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be rereferred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INCREASES IN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 52) to provide increases in service-connected

disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, and insert:

"SEC. 4. Section 315 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 is amended by deleting the following figures in paragraphs (a) through (p), respectively: '\$17', '\$33', '\$50', '\$66', '\$91', '\$109', '\$127', '\$145', '\$163', '\$181', '\$420', '\$279', '\$329', '\$371', '\$420', and '\$420', and inserting in lieu thereof the figures '\$19', '\$36', '\$55', '\$73', '\$100', '\$120', '\$140', '\$160', '\$179', '\$225', '\$450', '\$309', '\$359', '\$401', '\$450', and '\$450', respectively.

"SEC. 5. Subsection 316 (a) (1) of the Veterans' Benefit Act of 1957 is amended by deleting the following figures in clauses (A) through (H), respectively: '\$21', '\$35', '\$45.50', '\$56', '\$14', '\$24.50', '\$35', and '\$17.50', and inserting in lieu thereof the figures '\$23', '\$39', '\$50', '\$62', '\$15', '\$27', '\$39', and '\$19'.

"SEC. 6. Section 335 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following: 'counting 50 cents and over as a whole dollar.'

"SEC. 7. Section 336 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'The amounts payable hereunder shall be adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar, counting 50 cents and over as a whole dollar.'"

Page 5, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 8. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment, and sections 1 through 3 shall cease to begin in effect January 1, 1958."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' HOUSING LOANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4602) to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from \$10,000 to \$13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct-loan program for veterans, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in Senate amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, and in Senate amendment No. 6 with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 7, line 19, strike out "1958" and insert "1959."

Page 7, line 22, strike out "date." and insert "date."

Page 7, after line 22, insert:

"(g) (1) The Administrator shall commence the processing of any application for a loan under this section upon the receipt of such application, and shall continue such processing notwithstanding the fact that the assistance of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Committee has been requested by the

Administrator for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not such loan can be placed with a private lender.

"(2) If the assistance of such Committee has been requested by the Administrator in connection with any such application, and the Administrator is not notified by such Committee within (A) 20 days after such assistance has been requested, or (B) 20 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is the later, that it has been successful in enabling the applicant to place such loan with a private lender, the Administrator shall proceed forthwith to complete any part of the processing of such application remaining unfinished, and to grant or deny the application in accordance with the provisions of this section."

Page 7, line 25, strike out "1958" and insert "1959."

Page 8, line 7, strike out "1959" and insert "1960."

Page 9, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 500 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 694) is amended by striking out '11' and inserting in lieu thereof '12.'"

"(b) Subsection (g) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if a loan report or an application for loan guaranty relating to a loan under this title has been received by the Administrator on or before July 25, 1959, such loan may be guaranteed or insured under the provisions of this title on or before July 25, 1960."

"(c) Section 507 of such act (38 U. S. C. 694) is amended by striking out '11' and inserting in lieu thereof '12.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6:

Page 8, strike out lines 8 to 20, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) Subsection (d) of such section 513 is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence a new sentence as follows: 'That the Secretary of the Treasury shall also advance to the Administrator from time to time until July 25, 1959, such additional sums not in excess of \$50 million as the Administrator may request.'"

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out subsection (c) of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Subsection (d) of such section 513 is amended (1) by striking out '1957' and inserting '1959'; (2) by inserting immediately after 'so advanced' the following: 'under this sentence'; and (3) by inserting immediately after the first sentence therein the following new sentence: 'The Secretary of the Treasury shall also advance to the Administrator from time to time until July 25, 1959, such additional sums as the Administrator may request (not in excess of the difference between the amounts advanced under this subsection after June 30, 1955, and the maximum amounts which could have been advanced upon the request of the Administrator after June 30, 1955, and before the date of the request).'"

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the bill H. R. 4602 it provided \$200 million to be used as a direct-loan fund. In the other body this amount was cut to \$50 million. This amendment merely restores the \$200 million in the bill as it passed the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREATY AND AGREEMENT WITH THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6709) relating to the treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BONNER, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Messrs. GARMATZ, TOLLEFSON, and SHEEHAN.

KEY DEER

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1058) to preserve the key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys by the establishment of a National Key Deer Refuge in the State of Florida, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "there" and insert "therein."

Page 2, line 2, strike out all after "County," down to and including "wildlife." in line 7 and insert: "Florida, as he shall find to be suitable for the conservation and management of the said key deer and other wildlife: *Provided, however,* That no land shall be acquired by condemnation on any island that is traversed at any point by United States Highway No. 1."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what these changes are?

Mr. BONNER. I will say to the gentleman it is merely clarifying language; nothing new in it whatsoever.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks

on the veterans bill conference report previously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FOR THE RELIEF OF EDWARD J. MOSKOT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1682) for the relief of Edward J. Moskot, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "1954," insert "and from November 1, 1954, to November 15, 1954."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM R. HICKMAN AND NANNIE CONLEY AND HUSBAND, JACK CONLEY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1460) for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and husband, Jack Conley, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Hickman and" and insert "Hickman"; page 1, line 6, after "Conley," insert "Tina M. Hickman, Ray Conley, Mike Conley, W. B. Conley, Rebecca Conley, Louise Conley, Mary Frances Hickman, David B. Hickman, Tom R. Hickman, Jr., Ruth Conley, Willett J. Hickman, Jr., Martha Hickman, Ruth Hickman, and Roland Hickman"; page 1, line 6, after "Texas," insert "as their interests may appear"; amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and others."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts with respect to the bills he is now presenting to the House to which there are Senate amendments, those amendments have to do either with the elimination of the attorney's fee provision or in one instance sending the claim to the court, or other purely technical changes; is that correct?

Mr. LANE. That is right. May I say to the gentleman from New York that these are technical amendments having to do with the usual legal provision that is put on these bills.

Mr. KEATING. In no case is there any change in the amount of the award, is that correct?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 15, 1957
For actions of August 14, 1957
85th-1st, No. 147

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,14	Foreign aid.....1,14,25	Public Law 480.....9,38
Atomic energy.....13	Foreign trade.....38	Reclamation.....27,32
Beans.....29	Forestry.....11,20,39	Rice.....7
Budgeting.....23	Great plains program....18	School lunch.....6
Buildings.....24,30	Meatpackers.....8,35	School milk.....19
Cotton.....16,36	Military construction....9	Soil conservation.....18
Dairy products.....19,34	Monopolies.....8,26,35	Surplus commodities....38
Electrification....12,22,23	Peanuts.....40	Tax amortization.....5
Emergency facilities.....5	Personnel.....21,31	Textile products.....3
Farm program.....17	Poultry inspection.....2	Transportation.....4,15
Fisheries.....7,10	Price supports.....17	Water resources.....28
Flood control.....33,37	Property.....41	

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on poultry inspection bill. House agreed to conference report on mutual security authorization bill. Ready for President. Sen. Watkins urged passage of bill to transfer certain work under Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC. Sen. Stennis introduced and discussed bill to preserve cotton acreage history.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. By a vote of 226 to 163, agreed to the conference report on S. 2130, the mutual security authorization bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13431-5
Received from the President foreign-aid appropriation estimates for 1958 of \$3,386,860,000; to Appropriations Committee (H. Doc. 225). p. 13493
Reps. Albert and Cannon announced that the foreign-aid appropriation bill is to be debated beginning today, Aug. 15. pp. 13450, 13472
2. POULTRY INSPECTION. Received the conference report on S. 1747, the poultry inspection bill (H. Rept. 1170). pp. 13472-5
3. TEXTILE IDENTIFICATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 469, to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products. pp. 13435-50
4. TRANSPORTATION. Passed, 177-176, without amendment S. 1383, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13450, 13462-71

Received the conference report on S. 939, to limit the applicability of free or reduced transportation rates for Government traffic. pp. 13475-6

Passed without amendment H. R. 8825, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to revise the definition of "contract carrier by motor vehicle." pp. 13477-8

5. EMERGENCY FACILITIES. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 232, which limits ODM tax-amortization authority to certificates made on or before Aug. 22, 1957, and (1) facilities to produce new or specified defense items and (2) facilities to provide research development of experimental services for the defense program. This bill will now be sent to the President.
6. FEDERAL AID. Rep. Kelley questioned turning over to the States various Federal-aid programs, including the school lunch program. p. 13480
7. FISH; RICE. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee referred S. 1552, to develop methods for commercial production of fish on flooded rice acreage, back to the subcommittee for further hearings. (The subcommittee had previously reported the bill to the full committee.) p. D780

SENATE

8. MONOPOLIES; MEATPACKERS. Sen. Watkins urged passage of S. 1356, to transfer certain work under the Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC, and discussed the background and need for such legislation. pp. 13401-06
9. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries (p. 13388). House conferees were appointed Aug. 13.
10. FISHERIES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment S. 2349, to facilitate the conduct of fishing operations in Alaska, and to promote the conservation of its fishery resources (S. Rept. 963). p. 13344
11. FORESTRY. Sen. Neuberger inserted several articles discussing the controversy over the termination of Federal supervision over the Klamath Indians, including timberlands. pp. 13352-53
12. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Morse inserted a resolution and letter favoring construction of the Hells Canyon dam. p. 13356
Several Senators discussed and inserted material on the nomination of Jerome K. Kuykendall to be a member of the Federal Power Commission. pp. 13406-12, 13420-24
13. ATOMIC ENERGY. Several Senators discussed and inserted material on the development of atomic reactors. pp. 13356-58, 13388-92, 13400-01
Sen.
14. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Johnson, Knowland, and others discussed the possible effects of the President's statement on the possibility of a special session of Congress if adequate funds are not included in the mutual security appropriation bill. pp. 13412-16
15. TRANSPORTATION. Received an Ala. legislature resolution urging a reduction in excise taxes levied on transportation. p. 13343

along with the memorial addresses delivered today.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of William M. Toland, to be postmaster at Browning, Ill., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2130) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5168. An act for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; and

H. R. 5707. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 232) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2130. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1562. An act for the relief of Maj. John P. Ruppert; and

H. R. 8090. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

NOMINATION OF JEROME K. KUYKENDALL TO BE A MEMBER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the memorial services have been concluded. May I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may state it.

MR. KNOWLAND. Under the parliamentary situation, is the Senate now in executive session?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator is correct. The Senate will now, under the agreement heretofore made, resume the consideration of executive business, and the question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jerome K. Kuykendall, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission?

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LIFE STORY OF LON CHANEY

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, at the request of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which the Senator from Colorado prepared relative to the motion picture "Man of a Thousand Faces," which portrays the life story of Lon Chaney.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Tomorrow night the motion picture industry and Universal-International Pictures will premier, here in Washington, a motion picture called *Man of a Thousand Faces*. It is the life story of Lon Chaney.

Although I have not seen the picture as yet, if it follows the life of Lon Chaney closely, it should be a great picture. I believe it is particularly fortunate that Universal chose Jim Cagney to play the role. He should do it justice.

Colorado has a particular interest in this picture, because it has a particular interest in Lon Chaney. He was born in Colorado Springs, Colo., on April Fool's Day, 1883. His early schooling was in the public schools of that city, but he had to give up school at an early age to begin making his own way by conducting tourists along the trails of our famous and beloved Pike's Peak.

Lon Chaney's first contact with the theater came in Colorado. Again, it was Colorado Springs, in its opera house, where he got a job as a property boy. He made his first stage appearance in that city at the age of 17, when he and his brother, then a theater manager, wrote and presented a play entitled "The Little Tycoon." Lon and his brother follow this with a cycle of Gilbert and Sullivan in their home city, but had to give it up when they ran out of funds while taking this first venture on a road tour. By this time Lon was quite an accomplished comedian and dancer and moved on to Chicago to continue what turned out to be a pathway to fame, but one studded with tragedy and pathos.

Chaney was the second of four children born to deaf and dumb parents. His father, an immigrant from Ireland, owned a barber shop in Colorado Springs. When Lon was nine and in the fourth grade in school, his mother became permanently helpless from inflammatory rheumatism. For more than 3 years Lon spent most of his time nursing her. He had to exchange thoughts with his

parents by means of his hands in sign language. This use of his hands and facial expression is considered to have been the groundwork of Chaney's ability as an actor and for his unusually expressive gestures. Today his accomplishments are legendary. His pictures, too numerous to mention, are milestones of personal achievement and many of them mark the epochs of technological progress of one of America's great native industries.

It is said that he was exceedingly fond of a quip that sprang up about him during the time that he was making one successful picture after another. It was a sign that someone supposedly posted on the studio wall which read: "Don't step on it, it may be Lon Chaney."

In a few days it will be exactly 27 years since Lon Chaney died. I hope this biographical picture, which is being released as a part of the motion picture industry's 50th year of production in Hollywood, will do two things in particular: (1) Serve as a tribute to a man who persistently developed his skills in the true American way, who rose from the humble home of an immigrant barber in Colorado to world fame and great fortune, but was ever mindful of the opportunities that are available to industrious young people in this country; (2) serve to remind many of the producers of motion pictures today that his pictures were successes because they had good stories that depended on acting skill rather than expensive exploitation and cheap suggestive appeals such as we have witnessed in and around Washington and the Capitol of late.

I particularly wish to point out this contrast to the motion picture industry and take this opportunity to echo the sentiments of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and others as well, regarding the use of the Senate galleries for these promotion stunts.

I have attached to my statement the text of a testimonial resolution from Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, commending the "Man of a Thousand Faces" as a due honor to our famous Coloradan, Lon Chaney, so that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

A TESTIMONIAL

Whereas Universal-International has designated *Man of a Thousand Faces*, starring James Cagney, Dorothy Malone, and Jane Greer, as its golden jubilee film, commemorating 50 years of motion picture production in Hollywood; and

Whereas the film portrays the life story of Lon Chaney, one of the immortals of the motion-picture industry:

The Motion Picture Association of America hereby commends Universal-International on the production's subject matter and on the naming of this outstanding film as its golden jubilee selection.

ERIC JOHNSTON,
President, Motion Picture Association
of America.

CIVIL RIGHTS

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the value of the Senate rules on debate was fully illustrated during the course of the discussion on the civil-rights bill. The measure was subjected to searching scrutiny. It was examined from every viewpoint. And in the course of the debate many facts emerged which changed minds and altered opinions.

Unfortunately, one aspect did not emerge until it was too late for action. It was the fact that the bill might, under some interpretations, carry a strong

threat to the traditional freedom of the press.

The parliamentary situation is such that nothing can be done as far as the present bill is concerned. Both Houses have acted, and the technical language is not in dispute.

However, the situation can be handled easily by a concurrent resolution. I have asked that one be prepared, and have forwarded it to interested parties in the House and have presented it to interested Members of the Senate.

I intend to sponsor such a resolution in the Senate, when the differences in the civil-rights bill are finally resolved.

The intention of Congress, of course, was simply to protect the integrity of executive hearings from Commission employees who might act through malice. There was no intention to interfere with legitimate news gathering.

It would be a travesty to cast a cloud upon a basic right—freedom of the press—in a bill intended to promote rights. Therefore, I want my colleagues to know that there will be immediate—and I believe successful—action to remedy the situation, once the differences between the two Houses are resolved.

The concurrent resolution to which I refer reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 6127), entitled "To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States," is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 102, strike out paragraph (g) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission. Whoever releases in public without the consent of the Commission evidence or testimony taken in executive session shall be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year."

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives pertaining to H. R. 8240, the military construction bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. STENNIS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF A STADIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives pertaining to H. R. 1937, to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1937) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ATOMIC ENERGY AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, because the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have not signed separate views to accompany the report of the committee on S. 2674, the atomic energy authorization bill, and four Members of the House have signed a separate statement of views, on H. R. 8996, the House version, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, that the separate statement of the views of the four House Members be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that the Members of the Senate will have the benefit of these views when they consider the bill.

There being no objection, the separate statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPARATE STATEMENT SECTIONS OPPOSED

We are opposed to the following sections of the authorization bill: 101 (b) (8); Project 58 (b) (8); 101 (e) (14); Project 58 (e) (14); 101 (e) (15); Project 58 (e) (15); 110 (a), (b), and (c); 111 (a) (1), (2), and (3).

Although wholly in accord with providing authorization for appropriation of the funds necessary to maintain an energetic atomic energy program both for military and peaceful purposes, we feel compelled to state separate views as to certain changes made by the majority to the authorization bill while it was before the Joint Committee.

In general, we feel that the modifications will result in expensive and unnecessary Government reactor construction, involving the expenditure of \$58 million, neither requested by the Atomic Energy Commission nor approved by the Bureau of the Budget. They are designed to promote the growth of public power and to hinder development of atomic power by our traditional resources of private industry.

There are other ways of fostering the atomic industry without having the Gov-

ernment enter into all of the expensive construction and operations envisaged by this bill. There are other ways which appear to foster more reactor technology for the taxpayer's dollar. The alternatives should have been thoroughly studied at a time when Congress is most interested in economy. They were not. The result is that under this bill the encouragement which was given to private industry by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to begin entering the atomic energy field in cooperation with the Government is now almost completely wiped out.

HISTORY

On March 1, 1957, the Atomic Energy Commission wrote to the Congress requesting authorizations for its construction program in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. On March 12, Mr. Durham introduced the bill (H. R. 5889) in the House of Representatives. Hearings on the bill which disposed of all of the matters in the authorizing legislation except for the reactor program were held by the Subcommittee on Legislation on April 10 and 16. On April 16, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, made a speech on the floor of the House condemning the methods used in authorizing and appropriating moneys for the reactor program of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Subcommittee on Legislation then held special hearings on May 23 and June 10 after which a new bill amending section 261 was introduced (S. 2243 and H. R. 7992). Although there was disagreement with every point of law raised by Mr. CANNON, those who did disagree went along with the amendment to section 261 even though it required congressional approval of the Commission's participation in cooperative programs in the new atomic energy industry.

Mr. CANNON's main objective, however, was not limited to mere technicalities of authorization or appropriation law. His main position was in opposition to privately owned reactor facilities and in favor of publicly owned reactors. Mr. CANNON's closing remarks were:

"It is my firm conviction that the Federal Government should immediately initiate construction at existing atomic-energy sites of full-scale atomic electric powerplants."

The modifications now made by the majority of the committee to the authorization bill start the Commission down this path.

PROVISIONS OBJECTED TO

Let us look at the provisions:

"SEC. 101 (b).— * * *

"8. Project 58-b-8, production reactor for special nuclear materials; development, design, and engineering only, \$3 million. The Commission shall proceed with sufficient design work, together with appropriate engineering and development work, necessary for the Commission to begin construction as soon as practicable after authorization by the Congress, of a large-scale single- or dual-purpose reactor for the production of special nuclear materials. The Commission shall submit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report on its design for this project, including cost estimates and schedule of construction, not later than April 1, 1958.

"SEC. 101 (e).— * * *

"14. Project 58-e-14, natural uranium, graphite-moderated, gas-cooled, power reactor prototype designed for the production of approximately 40,000 electrical kilowatts, \$40 million.

"15. Project 58-e-15, plutonium recycle experimental reactor designed for the production of 15,000 electrical kilowatt equivalent, \$15 million.

"SEC. 110. Prototype power reactor facilities: (a) The Commission shall proceed with the design engineering, and construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of the

Aug. 16, 1957

"The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the language of H.R. 8456 as passed by the House on August 2, 1957. The bill reported herewith is a substitute for the House amendment which has been agreed upon by the conferees. It differs in only two substantial respects from the House amendment."

PRODUCTION OF WHEAT ON EXCESS ACREAGE

"The House amendment provided that no wheat produced from any acreage in excess of acreage allotments should be considered in determining the supply of wheat for purposes of future acreage allotments and marketing quotas or in determining the level of price support. The committee amendment provides that wheat grown on acreage in excess of acreage allotments (including that produced in noncommercial wheat States where there are no farm allotments) will be counted for such purposes except for the estimated quantity of wheat which is produced on farms taking advantage of the feed exemption provided by this bill."

COUNTING OF EXCESS ACREAGE FOR HISTORY PURPOSES

"The House amendment provided that no acreage planted in excess of acreage allotments would be counted for history purposes in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Because of the House action striking section 3 out of the bill, a change was necessary in this provision in order to leave the noncommercial wheat States in the same position they now occupy. The committee amendment leaves the law with respect to the noncommercial wheat area unchanged and provides that acreage planted to wheat in that area will continue to be counted as history for future acreage allotment purposes.

"Both these amendments were recommended by the Department of Agriculture in its reports to the chairman of the House and Senate conferees on the bill."

12. POULTRY INSPECTION. Agreed to, and sent to the Senate, the conference report on S. 1747, to provide for the compulsory inspection by this Department of poultry and poultry products. pp. 13738-39
13. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 7900, to authorize the Secretary to sell certain Title III Bankhead-Jones lands in Mich. to private individuals (H. Rept. 1187). p. 13757
14. INFORMATION. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported H.J.Res. 313, designating the week of Nov. 22-28, 1957, as National Farm-City Week. p. D792
Rep. Hoffman criticized the withholding of Government information from Congress and the public. pp. 13746-50
15. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee ordered reported to the full committee without recommendation H.R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. p. D792
16. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 607, to increase the annuities payable to retired employees from the civil service retirement fund. p. D793

17. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The conferees agreed to file a conference report on H.R. 8240, to authorize certain construction at military installations, including the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries. p. D793
18. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION. Passed without amendment H.R. 8888, to extend the unemployment compensation program to employees of non-wholly owned Federal instrumentalities of the U.S. pp. 13737-38
19. WATER UTILIZATION. Both Houses received from the Bear River Compact Commission a report relative to negotiations between Ida., Utah, and Wyo. with respect to the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries. pp. 13645, 13757
20. INSECT CONTROL. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment on Aug. 14, S. 1805, to provide relief for persons and firms for the direct expenses incurred by them for fumigation of premises in the control and eradication of the khapra beetle (H. Rept. 1140). p. 13494
21. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following legislative program: Mon., Aug. 19, the Consent Calendar, to be followed by consideration of these bills under suspension of the rules: H.R. 9020, transfer of Packers and Stockyards work to FTC, H.R. 376, to prohibit trading in onion futures, H.R. 5497, recreationsl and fish and wildlife development under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, S. 939, the conference report relative to Government transportation services at free or reduced rates, H.R. 5384, relative to preserving competitive through transportation rates for rail carriers; Tues., the AEC appropriation bill; Wed., a resolution for consideration of H.R. 6127, the civil rights bill, if reported by the Rules Committee by that time. pp. 13740, 13744
22. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 19. p. 13757

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. PERSONNEL. Sen. Mansfield inserted W. P. McCahill's, Secretary, President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, recent address, "Employment in Professions and Industries." pp. A6735-6
24. INDUSTRIAL USES. Rep. Avery inserted a statement describing the organization of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, and pointing out certain recommendations concerned with the financing and administration of the program. pp. A6737-40
25. DROUGHT RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Sen. Yarborough inserting an article, "Drought Again Rears Ugly Head in Southwest Areas," and stating that "these signs underscore the urgency for helping the stricken farmers in the stricken areas." p. A6741
Rep. May inserted an editorial, "The Drought, The Surplus, and Foreign Assistance." p. A6753
26. HOG PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jensen stating that "farmers hold the key to future hog prices," and inserting a table showing pig crop and average farm price at point of first sale from 1940 to 1957. p. A6742
Extension of remarks of Rep. Laird stating that "agricultural research has shown hog producers how to meet consumer demand for lean pork and to cut the fat surplus at the same time." pp. A6769-70

the first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the

the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the

the sixth is the fact that the
the seventh is the fact that the

the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the

the tenth is the fact that the
the eleventh is the fact that the

the twelfth is the fact that the
the thirteenth is the fact that the

the fourteenth is the fact that the

THE FIFTH

the sixteenth is the fact that the
the seventeenth is the fact that the

the eighteenth is the fact that the
the nineteenth is the fact that the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 20, 1957
For actions of August 19, 1957
85th-1st, No. 150

CONTENTS

Accounting.....5	Farm program.....7,42,48	Milk prices.....35
Acreage allotments.....3	Federal aid.....41	Organization.....6
Administrative law.....14	Feed grains.....3	Personnel.....29,51,52,53
Appointments.....30	Food additives.....38	Poultry inspection.....1,2
Appropriations.....1,12,13	Food processing.....39	Price supports.....48
Atomic energy.....21	Foreign aid.....12,49	Public Law 480.....11
Budgeting.....37	Forestry.....25,50	Reclamation.....23,44
CCC.....3	Government competition..16	Research.....1
Census.....31	Housing.....1,11	Rural development.....30
Committees.....3	Humane slaughter.....54	Security.....52
Conservation.....24	Information.....34	Soil bank.....43
Cooperatives.....40	Interest rates.....9	Soil conservation.....36
Cotton.....4,28	Legislative program.....17	Statehood.....46
Disaster relief.....4,13	Livestock.....19,47,54	Transportation.....15,20
Education.....33	Loans.....8	Water pollution.....32
Electrification.....8	Manpower utilization....51	Water resources.....10,22
Family farms.....42,45	Marketing.....40	Watersheds.....27
Farm-City Week.....34	Meatpackers.....19	Water utilization.....26
Farm prices.....42	Meat promotion.....47	Wheat.....18

HIGHLIGHTS: (See Page 6.)

SENATE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958. Passed with amendments H.R. 9131, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1958. The committee amendments were adopted en bloc (pp. 13795-7). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Williams (on behalf of himself and Sen. Humphrey) to provide \$3.5 million for poultry inspection to be effective upon enactment of S. 1747, the poultry inspection bill (p. 13832). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Sparkman to provide \$300,000 for farm housing research to be conducted by the land-grant colleges through grants from the Housing and Home Finance Agency (p. 13832). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Hayden to ratify obligations from this bill for the period from July 1, 1957 until enactment (p. 13797). Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 13794-7, 13808-29, 13832, 13833-7
2. POULTRY INSPECTION. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1747, the poultry inspection bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13829-31
3. COMMITTEES; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; FEED GRAINS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported the following bills:
Without amendment, H.R. 8508, providing for the election of two county committees in certain counties (S. Rept. 1040);

With amendments, H.R. 8030, to eliminate the requirement that notice of intention not to plant the full acreage allotted must be filed with the county committee in order for a farmer to receive credit for future acreage allotment purposes (S. Rept. 1039); and

With amendment, H.R. 2486, to authorize CCC to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under the emergency feed program (S. Rept. 1041). p. 13760

4. DISASTER RELIEF; COTTON. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported without amendment the following bills:
S. 304, to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers in disaster areas; and
S. 314, to assist the U. S. cotton textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market. p. D796
5. ACCOUNTING. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 1799, to change various legal provisions so as to facilitate the payment of Government checks. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13794-5
6. ORGANIZATION. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 1791, to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 to apply to reorganization plans submitted before June 1, 1959. House conferees have not been appointed. p. 13795
7. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter from Leon Keyserling stating he had not advocated a reduction in the number of family-type farms and inserting a statement by the Conference on Economic Progress, "Statement in Answer to Misrepresentations About Full Prosperity For Agriculture." pp. 13801-3
8. REA LOANS. Sens. Carroll, Humphrey, Allott, Kefauver, Langer, and Chavez, discussed charges that REA loan authority has been transferred to the Office of the Secretary, and the request of the Government Operations Committee that Secretary Benson testify in response to such charges. Sen. Carroll inserted a news article, "Hamil's Authority Over REA Now Subjected to Review." pp. 13803-7
9. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Humphrey criticized the administration's policy on interest rates and inserted a letter from the Minn. School Board Ass'n urging a study of the high interest rates on school construction bonds and an article, "Ike Probe Asked of School Bond Charges." pp. 13798-9
Sens. Humphrey and Kerr discussed the administration's role in raising interest rates on loans, and criticized the Secretary of the Treasury for "flexing" interest rates up, and the Secretary of Agriculture for "flexing" prices of agricultural products down." pp. 13799-801
10. WATER RESOURCES. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1556, granting consent to the Little Missouri River compact. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13803
11. HOUSING. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 8240, the military housing construction authorization bill, including a provision for the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480, for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries (pp. 13832-3). The House received the conference report but did not act upon it (H. Rept. 1193) (pp. 11873-82).

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1957

AUGUST 19, 1957.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. VINSON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8240]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, \$2,288,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,000.

Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility, \$249,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility, land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,417,000.

Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington: Land acquisition, \$40,000.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$110,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility, and land acquisition, \$95,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Research and development facility, \$2,496,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities, \$1,169,000.

Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational facilities, \$306,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$562,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop housing, \$937,000.

Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Utilities, \$1,920,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,719,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop housing, \$153,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities and utilities, \$4,205,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Community facilities, \$589,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$7,549,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

Ford Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,307,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

*(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)**(Alaskan Area)*

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$137,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase out of appropriations available for military construction family housing including necessary land at, or near, military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations as now or hereafter established for military housing constructed with appropriated funds.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal, Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,212,000".

(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$2,360,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,137,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Military Academy)" with respect to United States Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$9,950,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,983,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,870,000", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,039,000".

(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$212,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,874,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof "\$525,000".

(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,491,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,240,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,072,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Medical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof "\$876,000".

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Washington, strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof "\$669,000".

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Maryland, strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof "\$800,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, South Carolina, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,500,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas, strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,283,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)"—

(1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,893,000".

(3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike out "\$145,000" and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AREA"—with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$559,000".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$225,277,000", "\$74,984,000", and "\$534,254,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$237,320,000", "\$75,074,000", and "\$546,387,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof "\$136,000".

(2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,593,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot, Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,847,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES"—

(1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

(3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,373,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,783,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000".

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,000", "\$203,331,000", and "\$334,104,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing, permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock \$25,438,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$1,452,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for remedying effects of ground subsidies, \$1,500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, \$1,326,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront facilities, \$544,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,729,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, \$566,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$13,387,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Stations, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,089,000.

Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, California: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,310,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$5,728,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$27,535,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, \$384,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, \$3,401,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities (Tactical Air Navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and utilities, \$9,448,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,503,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, \$3,620,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California: Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$2,209,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$7,669,000.

Naval Air Facility, to be known as John H. Towers Field, and to be located at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, operational facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$3,200,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$6,841,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$2,372,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, troop housing, messhall, and utilities, \$2,643,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps School, Quantico, Virginia: Supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,923,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utilities, \$316,000

Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas: Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Maryland: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Utilities, \$236,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory foundations, \$1,602,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$1,613,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$443,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,000.

Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,244,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$759,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$1,297,000.

Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,750,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, \$7,576,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, community facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$332,000.

Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,000.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and community facilities, \$1,793,000.

Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$2,088,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational facilities, \$5,730,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.

Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities at White Beach, \$504,000.

Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities, \$1,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, \$884,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Supply facilities, \$397,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities, and land acquisition, \$326,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities: \$69,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operation facilities, \$4,392,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$59,056,000.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES", with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$86,397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,927,000".

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California, strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, strike out "\$1,675,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,030,000"; and with respect to the Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out "\$70,000" and insert in place thereof "\$170,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, "\$63,358,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$70,656,000".

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$102,956,000", "\$63,358,000", "\$202,807,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$103,555,000", "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, California, strike out "\$629,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,099,000".

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out "\$399,000" and insert in place thereof "\$563,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out "\$3,686,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,871,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000"; and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Lakeland, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

(6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

(7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place thereof "\$879,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,235,000".

(2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and insert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

(d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300", "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300", "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading, "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,169,000".

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California, strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,340,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

(5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,919,000".

(6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station, San Francisco, California, strike out "\$2,029,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,779,000".

(7) Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES", with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof "\$500,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

(d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000", and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$303,453,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000", and "\$451,393,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. *The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:*

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,100,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$614,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$429,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$905,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,299,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$632,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply facilities and community facilities, \$189,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,804,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$674,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Family housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$559,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,828,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,768,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Community facilities, \$244,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvement, \$694,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$956,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$130,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,153,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$358,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$44,428,000.

AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$10,410,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$899,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,912,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$13,104,000.

Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota: Community facilities, \$56,000.

Tinker Air Force Base: Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,777,000.

AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$5,826,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,987,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada: Community facilities, \$206,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,276,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,469,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,882,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,872,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Community facilities, \$262,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,209,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,848,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, \$8,249,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$938,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community facilities, \$436,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,909,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$900,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements, \$4,200,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,977,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$4,118,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$865,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land acquisition, \$50,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical facilities, \$952,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$337,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis, Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,216,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$745,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$496,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$848,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,344,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,458,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,487,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$5,557,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,966,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,076,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$536,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$2,320,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,361,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$14,638,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community facilities, \$100,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$1,976,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facilities, \$34,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, \$380,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$12,552,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, \$250,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land acquisition, \$37,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,504,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$936,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$231,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina Kansas: Community facilities, \$372,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,937,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,676,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,901,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$235,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,149,000.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,287,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,558,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$683,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Utilities and ground improvements, \$20,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$1,204,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community facilities, \$484,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$9,991,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$229,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$4,742,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$11,500,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$247,000.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,228,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,569,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,741,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$57,218,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$36,057,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical

facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$47,000,000.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,756,000".

Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York, strike out "\$729,000" and insert in place thereof "\$929,000"; and strike out "\$686,000" and insert in place thereof "\$886,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out "\$27,478,000" and insert in place thereof "\$29,442,000"; and strike out "\$16,192,000" and insert in place thereof "\$18,156,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 so much as reads "\$406,120,000" and "\$415,949,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$409,937,000" and "\$419,766,000", respectively.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington, strike out "\$1,716,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,717,000";

(2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Dakota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,220,000";

(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out "\$6,630,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,000";

(5) with respect to Ornard Air Force Base, Ornard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,935,000";

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and insert in place thereof "\$893,000";

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,676,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out "\$15,803,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,654,000";

(3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out "\$9,522,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,970,000";

(4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$12,001,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,508,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas, strike out "\$3,438,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,876,000";

(2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, strike out "\$4,081,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,088,000";

(3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi, strike out "\$500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$545,000";

(4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas, strike out "\$446,000" and insert in place thereof "\$529,000";

(5) with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$883,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,129,000";

(6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000";

(7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,304,000";

(8) with respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,556,000".

Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place thereof "\$825,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada, strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,500".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,363,000";

(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,218,000";

(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,473,000";

(4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$6,657,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,324,000".

Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out "\$2,684,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,527,000";

(2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$611,000";

(3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, strike out "\$1,598,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,905,000";

(4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington, strike out "\$4,724,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,197,000";

(5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out "\$3,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,010,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out "\$518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

Under the subheading "AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL AIDS"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$526,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,394,000".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "\$801,256,000", "\$532,454,000", and "\$1,339,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$824,300,000", "\$533,539,000", and "\$1,363,189,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$863,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,469,000";

(2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington, strike out "\$2,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,079,000";

(3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, strike out "\$2,470,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,080,000";

(4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$18,969,000" and insert in place thereof "\$30,521,000";

(5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,673,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,781,000";

(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,156,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,336,000";

(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out "\$1,130,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,560,000";

(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$21,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$27,035,000";

(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out "\$3,030,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,409,000";

(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California, strike out "\$2,392,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,779,000";

(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa, strike out "\$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,900,000";

(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin, strike out "\$4,876,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,726,000";

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "\$3,278,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,808,000";

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out "\$21,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,201,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

- (1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out "\$17,966,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,005,000";
- (2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out "\$473,000" and insert in place thereof "\$745,000";
- (3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$251,000";
- (4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out "\$5,990,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,763,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

- (1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out "\$17,121,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,471,000";
- (2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,000";
- (3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";
- (4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,063,000";
- (5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,064,000".

Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY"—with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND"—

- (1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,993,000";
- (2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place thereof, "\$500,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—

- (1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,939,000" and insert in place thereof, "\$7,530,000";
- (2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,220,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

- (1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,190,000";
- (2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,643,000";
- (3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "\$14,518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";
- (4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out "\$943,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";
- (5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,966,000";
- (6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "\$4,952,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,880,000";
- (7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$1,236,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,586,000";

(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$2,064,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,607,000";

(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "\$5,697,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,155,000";

(10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, strike out "\$1,491,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,027,000";

(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$661,000" and insert in place thereof "\$720,000";

(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$2,791,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,181,000".

Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "\$2,613,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,785,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000" and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000", "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

TITLE IV—FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 401. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installation for which family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

SEC. 402. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 403. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 404. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

SEC. 405. The second paragraph of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allowances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental charges collected from personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: Provided, That such payments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition."

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units (other than housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act.

(b) *Effective July 1, 1958, the provisions of section 419, Public Law 968, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, are hereby repealed.*

SEC. 407. (a) *Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate quarters under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services, notwithstanding that such quarters may have been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters. The net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of such quarters shall be paid from otherwise available appropriations.*

(b) *The provisions of this section shall be administered under regulations approved by the President.*

(c) *The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Secretary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the "Secretaries"), are each authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to (b) above, to designate as rental housing such housing as he may determine to be inadequate as public quarters.*

(d) *The Secretaries are each further authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to subsection (b) above, to lease inadequate housing to personnel of any of the mentioned services for occupancy by them and their dependents. The housing facilities leased, as herein provided, shall not be required to have been constructed with funds derived from appropriations specifically made for the purpose of the construction of rental housing for personnel of the services mentioned.*

(e) *All housing units determined pursuant to subsection (c) of this section to be inadequate shall, prior to July 1, 1960, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of.*

(f) *This section shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of Title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955.*

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. *The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.*

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$115,624,000; outside the United States, \$34,477,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$293,103,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$230,574,000; outside the United States, \$48,199,000; section 202, \$59,056,000; or a total of \$337,611,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$394,076,000; outside the United States, \$160,705,000; section 302, \$47,000,000; or a total of \$601,781,000.

SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 504. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 505. Contracts made by the United States under this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10 United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

SEC. 507. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorized any building construction project within the continental United States at an average nationwide unit cost in excess of—

(a) \$28 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(b) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(c) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(d) \$7,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters,

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitation on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 508. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$135,425,000".

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,

By L. H. G.

STERLING COLE,

By L. H. G.

L. H. GAVIN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

JOHN STENNIS,

HENRY M. JACKSON,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On July 10, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 8240, which was the fiscal year 1958 military construction and authorization for the three military departments. On August 12, 1957, the Senate passed H. R. 8240, amended.

The larger differences and the action agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

ARMY

In title I, the Army section of the bill, there were several items in disagreement. Some of them resulted from the decision of the executive branch to lower its budget request subsequent to the House hearings on H. R. 8240. To these changes by the Senate, the House found itself in substantial agreement.

Upon completion of the conference on title I of the bill, the Senate receded with respect to the item involving Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and the House receded with respect to the provision of a gas-heating system for Fort Devens, Mass.

Among the deficiency authorizations for the Army, the committee had raised the authorization for the hospital at Fort Jackson, S. C., from \$5,000,000 to \$10,400,000. It was the decision of the conferees that the higher figure should be \$7,500,000, an amount sufficient to provide a wholly usable hospital facility for this installation.

NAVY

In similar fashion, for budgetary or funding reasons, a large number of the Navy items were lowered or eliminated by the Senate. Most of these items which are not to be funded were accepted in their modified form by the House conferees.

Upon completion of the conference of title II of the bill, the Senate receded with respect to the item involving the construction of a pier at the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla., and also in the case of the Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif., where \$209,000 was added to the Senate figure for items relating to the extension of a runway. The Senate also receded, in part, for the Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., in order that one of the two requested headquarters buildings might be constructed. At the Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, S. C., the Senate receded in order that provision might be made for barracks and other needed facilities. \$48,000 was added to the Senate figure for the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va., for utilities. With respect to the naval air station, Chincoteague, Va., the House accepted the Senate figure.

The Senate had deleted \$270,000 at the Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms, Calif. Subsequent investigation by both committees revealed that the soil stabilization which would be performed under this authority was an urgently required item and the Senate receded.

Similarly, subsequent investigation by both committees revealed the importance of the work contemplated at the Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex., and at the Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md. The Senate, therefore, receded with respect to these two items. In Okinawa, certain waterfront facilities necessary at White Beach were restored in conference, with the Senate receding.

The House had allowed \$199,000 for operational facilities at the naval auxiliary air station, Edenton, N. C., while the Senate had allowed only \$160,000. In conference, it was determined that the item in its entirety should be stricken.

The House receded in connection with the naval air station, Lemoore, Calif., permitting the Senate reduction of approximately 10 percent to stand. The House also receded with respect to the increased amount granted for the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.

Other items which were the subject of recession by the House involved, for the most part, construction items which would not be funded during fiscal year 1958.

The Congress is familiar with the long legislative history involved in the provision of a flying facility for the Naval Academy. Again this year the matter came up for congressional consideration and the House inserted an item authorizing the acquisition of land for such a facility to be named John H. Towers Field (location undetermined). The Senate version of the bill contained no similar authority. Recent studies by both committees have revealed that Andrews Air Force Base would provide an apparently feasible and acceptable site for the now somewhat enlarged functions contemplated by the Navy. The conferees decided, therefore, to insert the following language which, in essence, preserves the thinking of both the House and the Senate:

Naval Air Facility, to be known as John H. Towers Field, and to be located at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, operational facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$3,200,000.

The conferees urge both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force to arrive at a prompt agreement for the use of such facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, and urge the Navy to proceed expeditiously in planning for such construction or modification as may be necessary to enable this facility to see early operation.

AIR FORCE

The House conferees found themselves in only minor disagreement with the Senate action on title III, the Air Force section of the bill. Again, as was the case with respect to the other two military departments, budgetary and funding considerations made reasonable the

deletion or lowering of certain of the items and the House, therefore, receded with respect to a large number of these changes.

At the conclusion of the conference on title III of the bill, the Senate receded with respect to an exchange facility at Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., the provision of a commissary at the Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, and all items at the Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.

At Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga., the Senate figure was raised in order to grant authority for the construction of a primary runway and its attendant taxiway.

The House receded with respect to the provision of a dormitory at Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., and the provision of an exchange facility at Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.

Virtually all of the other recessions by the House involved items which are not to be funded during fiscal year 1958.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Most of the general provisions in both the Senate and the House versions of the bill were identical. There were, however, some fundamental differences. These differences were found in sections 406 and 407 of the Senate bill.

Section 406 contained no counterpart in the House bill. It was designed, the House conferees were informed, to require that all housing, from whatever source, should be the subject of line item justification in military construction bills enacted after July 1, 1958. After extended discussion, the conferees agreed that the language should be modified in such fashion as to eliminate the applicability of the section to Wherry housing and, specifically, to render certain that Wherry housing would be acquired at any installation where Capehart housing is planned for construction.

The other section which was in substantial disagreement, section 407 of the Senate version, related to the granting of an authority for the occupancy of inadequate quarters on a rental basis, as distinguished from the surrender of an individual's whole housing allowance. The House conferees insisted on amendments which would (1) limit the housing affected to family quarters; (2) require that all housing determined to be inadequate should, prior to July 1, 1960, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished, or otherwise disposed of; (3) exclude so-called Wherry housing from the applicability of the section; and (4) require that the net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of the quarters be paid from otherwise available appropriations.

Section 506 of the Senate version, and its House counterpart, of the bill rescinds existing authorizations after they have been in existence for 4 years and contains certain exceptions. Among these exceptions in the House version of the bill was that relating to the authorizations of the rental guaranty for family housing that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, 82d Congress. The Senate version did not include this exception. After deliberation, the conferees agreed that this exception should be included and the Senate receded.

Section 411 of the House bill, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, in effect, required that the Secretary of Defense inform the Senate and the House of Representatives, for appropriate congressional consideration, whenever it was proposed to terminate or reduce the operations of any commercial- or industrial-type activity where such activity had been in operation for 5 or more years and required the services of 10 or more civilian employees, and the supplies or services furnished by such activity were to be furnished by other than civilian employees of the United States. After deliberation, the House receded with respect to this section.

Section 412 of the House version of the bill, which similarly found no counterpart in the Senate version, prohibited the use of the national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, as a basis for negotiated contracts, as distinguished from competitive bidding. The section contained certain exceptions to this limitation.

While both the Senate and House conferees were in very substantial agreement that the end to be achieved was a proper one, it was decided that action to this end should be embodied in separate legislation and the House, therefore, receded.

The Senate version of the bill contains cost limitations with respect to cold storage and regular warehousing, permanent barracks, and bachelor officer quarters. The House receded with respect to this section.

The Senate and the House were in disagreement with respect to the amount of additional authority which should be granted for the Air Force Academy. The House on the one hand agreed that a flying facility should be provided at the Academy site while the Senate felt that another airfield in that area could be used for this activity. The House conferees felt that at least on a temporary basis, other flying facilities could be used and therefore receded.

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, and Air Force titles totaled \$1,416,573,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version totaled \$1,203,413,000 or \$213,165,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, and III is \$1,232,495,000. This latter sum is \$184,078,000 less than the House version and \$29,082,000 more than the Senate version.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
By L. H. G.
STERLING COLE,
By L. H. G.
LEON H. GAVIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been discussing with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], a matter in connection with the poultry-inspection bill. It is covered by the statement on the part of the managers on the part of the House, which appears in the report. I ask that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that all points of discussion may be covered by the proceedings which will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1170) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1747) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the language of H. R. 6814 as passed by the House on July 9, 1957. The bill reported herewith is a substitute for the House amendment which has been agreed upon by the conferees. Except for changes of a clarifying or technical nature, following are the differences between the House amendment and the committee substitute.

SECTION 5

This section follows substantially the House language but has been modified to include a provision of the Senate bill which provides that application for a hearing by the Secretary may be made by an appropriate State official, as well as by those persons designated in the House amendment. As recommended by the conferees, the section now provides that three classes of persons may make application to the Secretary for designation of an area as a "major consuming area." These are: (1) Any appropriate State official representing a substantial portion of such area; (2) any appropriate local official or agency of a substantial portion of such area; or (3) an appropriate local poultry industry group in such area.

The committee of conference reemphasizes the fact that this provision as reported by the conferees provides that the public hearing contemplated is a quasi-legislative hearing and the facts or opinions submitted thereat may be supplemented by investigations by the Secretary to aid in his determination as to whether a designation of an area should be made. Such hearing and investigation are to develop not only information as to the volume of poultry marketed in a major consuming area, but all other facts which would bear upon the question as to whether the designation of such an area will tend to effectuate the purposes of the act.

SECTION 6

Section 6 is substantially the House language. Subsection (b) was amended to make it clear that reinspection, quarantine, and segregation of poultry may take place at any time and need not be done when the plant is in operation.

In connection with post mortem inspection, the committee of conference in adopting the House language reiterates the interpretation

of the language as contained in the House report that "the Secretary * * * shall at all times provide sufficient inspectors and employ such procedures as will not slow down processing operations in the plants being inspected."

SECTION 7

The committee of conference has followed the House language in section 7 and, in doing so, points out that there is no authority in this bill for the Secretary to withdraw inspection from all of the plants operated by a company if he finds that only one or more of such plants are not complying with regulations. Inspection is on a plant-by-plant basis and may be withdrawn only from the particular establishment "whose premises, facilities, or equipment, or the operation thereof, fail to meet the requirements of this section."

SECTION 8

Subsection (a) was identical in both the House and Senate versions except that the Senate bill contained authority for the Secretary to permit reasonable variations and grant exemptions from the labeling requirements in any manner not in conflict with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The conference substitute permits exemptions but requires only that they shall not be in conflict with the purposes of this act.

Subsection (b) was identical in both bills except that the Senate bill used the words "in any particular" in connection with labeling which is "false or misleading." The conferees have adopted the Senate language in this case as being more nearly in conformity with other similar statutes.

SECTION 9

Section 9 is identical with the language of the House amendment except that a modification has been made in subsection (i) to permit the Secretary to grant some extension of time to processors of "New York dressed" poultry to comply with the provisions of the act. The effective date of the act with respect to its compulsory features is January 1, 1959. In view of the time which has elapsed since introduction and committee consideration of the bills the conference committee felt that some extension of this time might be needed by some processors of "New York dressed" poultry to permit the change-over of their plant and operations to the processing of eviscerated poultry. The amendment to the House language will permit the Secretary to grant such extension "pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed" by him. It is, however, the intent of the bill that the prohibition against "New York dressed" poultry be made fully effective as soon as practicable.

SECTION 13

The committee of conference has adopted the House language in section 13 and, in doing so, points out that it is the intention of the committee that subsection (b) of this section should apply to public warehousemen who handle poultry products in the course of their movement from processor to consumer on the same terms as it will apply to a carrier. A public warehouseman is in precisely the same position as a carrier except that, instead of transporting, he stores goods for the general public for hire. It is the opinion of the committee of conference, therefore, that public warehousemen should be treated by the Secretary in exactly the same manner as carriers in enforcing the provisions of this act.

SECTION 17

The House language required knowledge as an element of guilt under this section with respect to a person who sells unwholesome or adulterated poultry under one of the exemptions of the act. The Senate bill did not require knowledge in this respect and the conference bill follows the Senate language.

SECTION 20

The conference bill follows substantially the wording of the House amendment with the addition of language to make it clear that the rates of overtime and holiday pay to be charged processing establishments may be established at a reasonable uniform rate instead of being figured on an individual basis. The holidays to be counted with respect to Federal employees are those which apply to Federal civil-service employees either by law or by Executive or administrative order. Holidays to be counted with respect to State employees will be those legally observed by employees of that State.

SECTION 24

The Senate bill contained no provision similar to section 24 of the House amendment. In view of adoption by the conference committee of the House language in section 19, providing that "the jurisdiction of the Secretary within the scope of this act shall be exclusive," the committee felt that section 24 would neither add to nor detract from the legal effect of the rest of the bill but might be confusing. It therefore did not include this section in the conference bill.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
JOHN C. WATTS,
CLARK W. THOMPSON,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 319. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State;

S. 364. An act for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.;

S. 534. An act to amend section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the construction, reconditioning, or remodeling of vessels under the provisions of such section in shipyards in the continental United States;

S. 538. An act to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 556. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clark County, Nev., to the State of Nevada for the use of the Nevada State Board of Fish and Game Commissioners;

S. 620. An act to transfer ownership to Allegany County, Md., of a bridge loaned to such county by the Bureau of Public Roads;

S. 919. An act to provide that certain employees in the Postal Field Service assigned to road duty, and rural carriers, shall receive the benefit of holidays created by Executive order, memorandum, or other administrative action by the President;

S. 1113. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Gloucester, Mass.;

S. 1417. An act relating to the affairs of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma;

S. 1631. An act to amend certain sections of title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

S. 1823. An act to authorize the conveyance of Bunker Hill Island in Lake Cumberland near Burnside, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for public park purposes; and

S. 1971. An act to amend sections 4 (a) and 7 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 939) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 959) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that he offer his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I send to the desk an amendment which is submitted on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Marketing research and service," for marketing services, \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 1747 of the 85th Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senate has just adopted the conference report on the mandatory poultry inspection bill. The purpose of this amendment is to implement that legislation by providing the necessary funds with which to pay the inspectors.

I understand that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is favorable to the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Delaware what evidence there is to indicate that this is the correct amount? Why cannot it be less? We have had no evidence about it in the Appropriations Committee.

As the senior member of the committee on this side of the aisle, I should like to know about that. I am glad the chairman of the committee has agreed to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Department of Agriculture gave us that figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I called the Department of Agriculture; and it is my understanding that the Department budget office indicated, in response to request from committee staff, that consideration has been given to that figure. I told the chairman of the committee that we were perfectly willing to have the figure taken to conference, with that understanding. The bill the Senate passed a moment ago makes it mandatory for the Government to provide these inspectors.

Mr. HAYDEN. We had telephoned information that the Department of Agriculture had given preliminary consideration to this amount of money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

FARM HOUSING RESEARCH

To carry out the provisions of section 603 of the Housing Act of 1957 for farm housing research to be conducted by land-grant colleges through grants for research study and analysis, \$300,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this amendment relates to a provision of the Housing Act which was signed into law about 1 month ago. I think it is highly important that this work be begun.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand it is a 2-year proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it is a 2-year proposal, for \$300,000 for the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

Mr. HAYDEN. Inasmuch as a part of the present fiscal year has passed, will the Senator from Alabama be willing to reduce the item by one-half? Then we can take the amendment to conference and can see what will happen there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee and also with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I would be willing to cut the item in half, with the understanding that the provision of some money in this case will enable those responsible for the work to begin their plans; and in January or February, in the next session, when another supplemental bill is before the Senate, perhaps by then those who are in charge of the work will be able to give the Senate an understanding of what will be necessary in order to carry the work forward. It may be that \$150,000 will be sufficient for the first year.

Mr. HAYDEN. And of course, a new program takes some time to get underway.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Alabama has discussed the matter with me. It is another case in which there has been no estimate in connection with the new law, which was signed on June 30, and, as the Senator from

Alabama has said, authorizes \$300,000 for the 2 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have the chairman of the committee accept the amendment and take it to conference, to see what figure may be agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator from Alabama modify the amendment in the way indicated?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Mr. President, I modify the amendment by striking out "\$300,000", and inserting "\$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, so I can submit the conference report on House bill 8240, which authorizes certain construction at military installations? The report contains items affecting the appropriation bill the Senate has been considering today, and the report has already been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I think it would be appropriate to have the report considered at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have before me certain statements which are explanatory of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, and Air Force titles totaled \$1,416,573,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version totaled \$1,203,413,000 or \$213,165,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for title I, II, and III is \$1,232,495,000. This later sum is \$184,078,000 less than the House version and \$29,082,000 more than the Senate version.

I wish to direct the Members' attention to section 406 as it was agreed to by the conferees, which in substance is identical to that contained in the Senate version except

that it eliminates the applicability of the section to Wherry Housing and is designed to make certain that Wherry Housing would be acquired at any installation where title VIII Capehart Housing is planned for construction.

It is the intent of this legislation that the current housing programs of the various services continue as now contemplated through June 30, 1958. This section does not repeal any existing law. It simply requires that effective July 1, 1958, the number of military family housing units to be contracted for at or in support of any military installation must be first authorized by an annual military construction authorization act before it can be contracted for.

CHANGES TO H. R. 8240 (SENATE) IN CONFERENCE

Army—title I

Added Fort Sam Houston, Tex., land acquisition, \$675,000 (was in House version).

Replaced Fort Jackson hospital authorization in deficiency authorization section; conferees increased original amount of \$5 million to \$7,500,000 (South Carolina).

Navy—title II

Inside United States: (increased by \$14,181,000).

Added to NAS, Pensacola, Fla., \$3,512,000 for pier; final authorization, \$6,225,000.

Deleted entire item for NAAS, Edenton, N. C., \$199,000.

El Toro, Calif., Marine Corps Air Station, added \$209,000; final authorization, \$3,620,000.

Replaced John H. Towers Field (for Naval Academy) with some language change, and to be located at Andrews AFB, \$3,200,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., added \$1,500,000 for headquarters building, final authorization, \$2,372,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C., added \$1,501,000 for barracks; final authorization, \$2,643,000.

Marine Corps School, Quantico, Va., added \$48,000 for utilities; final authorization, \$1,923,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif., added \$207,000 for ground improvements, final authorization, \$2,331,000.

Replaced Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex., final authorization, \$2,649,000.

Replaced Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md., final authorization, \$1,452,000.

Outside United States (increased by \$504,000):

Replaced Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa, final authorization, \$504,000.

Air Force—title III (increased by \$13,722,000)

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., added \$393,000; final authorization, \$674,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, added \$141,000; final authorization, \$358,000.

Replaced Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa., \$2,438,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Ga., added primary runway and apron taxiway, \$10,750,000; final authorization, \$13,104,000.

New totals

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Inside United States.....	\$115,624,000	\$230,356,000	\$394,076,000
Outside United States.....	34,477,000	48,199,000	160,705,000
Classified.....	143,002,000	59,056,000	47,000,000
Total.....	293,103,000	337,611,000	601,781,000
Grand total.....	1,232,495,000		

DEFENSE OFFICIALS' COMMENTS ON APPROPRIATED FUNDS VERSUS CAPEHART

Reference to statements by military officials concerning appropriated fund housing versus payment (Capehart family housing construction programs. You will remember Secretary Wilson said when asked his opinion as a businessman:

"I think the answer to that is 'Yes,' that it is cheapest to do it with Government funds, unless you do it in such a way that it is more or less off your military post or something like that in a separate housing business.

"But if we have to be responsible for the rent for 20 years or something like that, or repurchase it like we have to do with warehouses, I would say it really would be cheaper to put the money up in the first place, because, basically, our Government has the best credit in the United States; it can borrow money cheaper.

"This was an effort, I suppose, to avoid taxing the people now with a big budget and trying to get the budget down."

Secretary Wilson further said in responding to a question concerning the possibility of overbuilding of family housing units:

"As I said awhile ago, I believe in evolution, not revolution, and I am very frank to say that if we could suddenly build within 1 year all the stated requirements of the services for housing, we would overbuild and we would have a particular reaction from the public, because these people are living someplace now; they are not quite living where they would like to, but millions of other Americans are not quite living where they would like to either.

"I think it [referring to family housing] needs to be improved and it is one of the morale factors in keeping the good men in the service. And I want to make some progress with it but I do not want to try to do it overnight and make some big mistakes."

Secretary Quarles when asked a similar question responded in part:

"I certainly agree that appropriated funds would show a lower cumulative cost over amortization."

Assistant Secretary of the Army Dewey Short when he appeared before the committee said in response to your question:

"Senator STENNIS. Would you mind a brief interruption right there? We have been concerned with you, about which is the best program. Are you free to give us an opinion—I will put it this way: Don't you think the Government gets more for its dollar just to go on and appropriate the money and build these houses?

"Mr. SHORT. There is no doubt about it. I have felt for years and think most of the members of the House Armed Services Committee have felt strongly for a long time that you get more for your dollar by having appropriated funds for houses. The only trouble is that the need is so great and the volume of money needed is so enormous we can't do it."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there was provided by the Congress for the fiscal year 1958 a total of \$211,183,000 for the medical-research programs, representing an increase of \$21 million over the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget for submission in the President's budget.

The National Institutes of Health submitted apportionment requests for the first quarter of the fiscal year, in accordance with provisions of the antideficiency statute, for a total of \$138,522,850. The Bureau of the Budget approved apportionment allowances of \$120,805,000 for the first quarter, a reduction of \$17,717,850.

The Senate should have no sympathy with the arbitrary and capricious administrative action of the Bureau of the Budget withholding a substantial portion of the funds appropriated by Congress for medical research. The appropriations subcommittees and the full Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress reviewed in great detail the research programs proposed by the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 1958. Scientists and doctors from both the National Institutes of Health and from private institutions presented factual testimony showing that there are urgent problems to be attacked by medical research, and that a successful attack requires additional funds. A committee of conference carefully reviewed the actions taken by both Houses, and reached decisions reflecting weeks of hearings and study.

Officials in the Bureau of the Budget then perverted a law—the antideficiency statute—to override the considered will of Congress by making available to the National Institutes of Health for the first quarter of fiscal year 1958, \$17.7 million less than was available and needed.

If the refusal of the Bureau of the Budget to make available to the National Institutes of Health the full amount appropriated by Congress is not reversed, the medical research of the entire National Institutes will be seriously set back. Carefully planned research will be cut off—for example, studies in infectious diseases, including research aimed at dealing more effectively with the influenza epidemic which now threatens the Nation. The continuing research for oral drugs for diabetes will be impaired. The research for drugs effective in dealing with cancer, which has developed so auspiciously over the past year, will be definitely handicapped, and many other urgent and vital programs will suffer. The full effects appear in detailed material submitted for inclusion in the hearings on the pending bill.

In addition to these specific harassing and very injurious impediments, the action of the Bureau of the Budget seriously interferes with the orderly and efficient execution of the Government's business by establishing fiscal uncertainty as a principle of administration. Finally, the action directly and irresponsibly thwarts the will of Congress.

In short, the Bureau of the Budget, under the guise of technical provisions of a law designed to prevent overspending by executive agencies, has imposed upon the American people their judgments as to the proper levels of research support contrary to the will and judgment of the Congress. This is a most serious and disturbing development in our system of Government, and one which Congress cannot allow to pass unrecognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to ask a few questions of the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Air Force Academy. I refer to the 47 housing facilities which are to be built at that Academy. They are to house the Superintendent and the deans. The Superintendent's house was to cost \$75,000. There were to be 2 houses at \$50,000 each, and 44 houses at \$30,000 each.

The first question concerns what is supposed to be custom-made furniture which has been requested. Has the committee approved of the type of furniture which has been requested?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that, in the first place, it was considered not proper to have a \$95,000 house for the head of the Academy. It was not considered proper to have a \$75,000 house for the dean, as the Senator will see from the committee report. The committee has not approved those figures. It was not considered proper to have the other items to which the Senator has referred. The board of estimates and those who have to do with the Air Academy at Colorado Springs have nothing to do with those figures.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What I should like to learn particularly is actually what the deans are paid. Do I understand correctly that each one has a house provided?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Each dean is supposed to have a house provided for him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many houses will be provided for how many teachers? The figure is 47, as I have read it from the record.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not be surprised if the Senator were correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I refer to page 375 of the hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I also see, by referring to page 376, that 25 percent of the houses are to be furnished, at a cost of \$5,000 for each house.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator refers to page 376 of the hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; in the middle of the page.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

I read from page 376 of the hearings:

Senator SMITH. You say you are not going to have custom-made furniture for the houses. Could you give us an estimate of how much it is going to cost for the furnishings in the houses?

Colonel Witters.—

I had a letter from Colonel Witters today. He is leaving. He is through with that place.

Colonel WITTERS. Senator, we are planning on 44 colonels' houses and 25 percent of them will be furnished with Government furniture at \$5,000 a house.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is as I understand it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, am I correct in my understanding that one-quarter of those houses will be furnished at a cost of about \$5,000 each?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, \$5,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the teachers' annual salary?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They will have salaries, they will have houses, and they will get furniture benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator from New Mexico tell me what their yearly salary is?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I cannot tell the Senator that. It depends on what category a teacher is in. As I understand from a member of the staff, it is roughly \$10,000 a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, their salaries would be approximately \$10,000 a year, and they would be furnished with houses to live in?

Mr. CHAVEZ. A salary, a house, \$5,000 worth of furniture, and the Senator would be surprised what else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the total sum for architect's fees for the Air Force Academy will be about \$8½ million, covering the entire project?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is low in his figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps the figure is \$9½ million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will be more than that. The total amount now appropriated, if the Senator from Mississippi will bear me out, is about \$116 million; but we shall be lucky, when we get through, if it is not \$150 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I find, from looking at page 383 of the hearings, that we shall pay the architects 6 percent for plans and 3 percent for supervision.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Some Georgia boys got in there. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from New Mexico give me his views on the chapel, which is supposed to be built at a cost of \$3 million?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe in prayer—

Mr. LAUSCHE. So do I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But not to that extent. Yes, I believe in prayer, but I think that the chapel sought to be provided for the Air Force Academy is un-Christian.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Un-Christian?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Ohio the Senator from New Mexico and I feel the same way, and I know the distinguished Representative from Texas, GEORGE MAHON, emphasized that, while we in the Congress cannot design the chapel, we can be critical. We were very critical a year ago. There was a great deal of criticism at that time. I have personally discussed the question with the Secretary of the Air Force and urged that he give just as much attention to that matter as he possibly can, to see if there cannot be built a chapel—and we want a chapel there—that is reasonable in cost, and is satisfactory and pleasing in design, without being extreme in design.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would say, over and

above that, let us have a chapel that has humility, that is fit to be the House of the Lord. Let us not have an extravaganza.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us have a chapel that will reflect Christianity.

An attempt is being made to construct a chapel at Colorado Springs which does not represent Christianity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico, on the basis of the questions which he put in the committee hearings. Every one of them indicates a purpose of practicing economy and using decent and good judgment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I truly believe that the Air Academy at Colorado Springs, the Academy at West Point, and the Naval Academy should all have religious services. But I do not believe that in order to carry out religious purposes it is desirable to have a type of chapel which indicates material wealth. I do not believe that is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9131) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of the project program for military construction approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for execution by the Services for the fiscal year 1958, and concurred in by the Senate, in the passage of the appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project program for military construction approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee for execution by the services, fiscal year 1958

*Department of the Army
CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES*

<i>Ordnance Corps:</i>	
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.....	\$2,288,000
Anniston Ordnance Depot, Ala.....	2,015,000
Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California.....	130,000
Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.....	758,000
Seneca Ordnance Depot, Oreg.....	136,000
Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebr.....	249,000
Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oreg.....	258,000
White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.....	16,530,000
Total, Ordnance Corps.....	22,364,000

<i>Quartermaster Corps:</i>	
Atlanta General Depot, Ga.....	1,579,000
New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.....	1,095,000
Fort Lee, Va.....	5,417,000
Seattle Quartermaster Depot, Wash.....	40,000
Sharpe General Depot, Calif.....	765,000
Fort Worth General Depot, Tex.....	1,789,000
Total, Quartermaster Corps.....	10,685,000

(b) Enlarging, diminishing, or otherwise affecting the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States.

(c) Impairing or affecting any existing rights of the United States to waters of the Klamath River Basin now beneficially used by the United States; nor any power or capacity of the United States to acquire rights in and to the use of the said waters of said basin by purchase, donation, or eminent domain.

SEC. 5 (a) The Federal representative to the Commission shall be appointed by the President, and shall report to the President either directly or through such agency or official of the Government as the President may specify. Such representative shall have no vote.

(b) The Federal representative shall receive compensation and shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as provided for experts and consultants under sections 5 and 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 and the Travel Expense Act of 1949, except (1) that his term of service shall be governed by the terms of this act and shall not be affected by the time limitations of said section 15, and (2) his per diem rate of compensation shall be in such amount, not in excess of \$100, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed \$15,000: *Provided*, That if the Federal representative be an employee of the United States he shall serve without additional compensation: *Provided further*, That a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed as such representative, without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such additional compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$15,000 in any one calendar year.

(c) The Federal representative shall be provided with office space, consulting, engineering, and stenographic service, and other necessary administrative services.

(d) The compensation of the Federal representative shall be paid from the current appropriation for salaries in the White House Office. Travel and other expenses provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be paid from any current appropriation or appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide for such expenses.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 31, line 18, strike out "\$100" and insert "\$50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1957 (H. REPT. No. 1193)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Technical Services Facilities

"(Ordnance Corps)

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, \$2,288,000.

"Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,000.

"Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,000.

"Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$758,000.

"Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility, \$249,000.

"White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,530,000.

"(Quartermaster Corps)

"Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility, land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

"New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

"Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,417,000.

"Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington: Land acquisition, \$40,000.

"Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$110,000.

"Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility, and land acquisition, \$95,000.

"(Chemical Corps)

"Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

"Dugway Proving Ground, Utah. Troop housing, \$54,000.

"(Signal Corps)

"Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

"(Corps of Engineers)

"Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Research and development facility, \$2,496,000.

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

"Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,000.

"(Transportation Corps)

"Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities, \$1,169,000.

"Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational facilities, \$306,000.

"Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$562,000.

"(Medical Corps)

"Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop housing, \$937,000.

"Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Utilities, \$1,920,000.

"Field Forces Facilities

"(First Army area)

"Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,719,000.

"(Second Army area)

"A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop housing, \$153,000.

"Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities and utilities, \$4,205,000.

"Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: community facilities, \$589,000.

"Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

"(Third Army area)

"Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

"Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

"Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

"Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$7,549,000.

"Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

"(Fourth Army area)

"Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

"Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

"Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

"Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

"(Fifth Army area)

"Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

"Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

"Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

"Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

"(Sixth Army area)

"Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

"Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,307,000.

"(Military Academy)

"United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

"(Armed Forces special weapons)

"Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

"(Tactical installations support facilities)

"Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

Outside continental United States

"(Alaskan area)

"Alaska general, Eleison Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

"(Pacific Command area)

"Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

"(Caribbean command area)

"Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$137,000.

"Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

"(United States Army, Europe)

"Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

"(Army Forces Far East)

"Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase out of appropriations available for military construction family housing including necessary land at, or near, military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations as now or hereafter established for military housing constructed with appropriated funds.

"SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, is amended, under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 101, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)' with respect to Red River Arsenal, Texas, strike out '\$1,808,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,212,000.'

"(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '\$44,003,000' and '\$133,671,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$44,407,000' and '\$134,075,000', respectively.

"SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 101, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Signal Corps)' with respect to Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out '\$2,360,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,137,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Military Academy)' with respect to United States Military Academy, New York, strike out '\$9,950,000' and insert in place thereof '\$11,983,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '\$129,096,000' and '\$236,060,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$131,906,000' and '\$238,870,000', respectively.

"SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 101, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)'—

"(1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out '\$1,736,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,039,000'.

"(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out '\$129,000' and insert in place thereof '\$212,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Quartermaster Corps)'—with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out '\$8,589,000' and insert in place thereof '\$9,874,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Chemical Corps)'—

"(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out '\$452,000' and insert in place thereof '\$525,000'.

"(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out '\$1,129,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,491,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Transportation Corps)'—

"(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out '\$1,055,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,240,000'.

"(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out '\$6,597,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,072,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Medical Corps)'—

"(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas, strike out '\$549,000' and insert in place thereof '\$876,000'.

"(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Washington, strike out '\$333,000' and insert in place thereof '\$669,000'.

"(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out '\$3,557,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,472,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Second Army Area)'—with respect to Fort Holabird, Maryland, strike out '\$612,000' and insert in place thereof '\$800,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Third Army Area)'—with respect to Camp Jackson, South Carolina, strike out '\$5,000,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,500,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Fourth Army Area)'—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas, strike out '\$12,922,000' and insert in place thereof '\$14,283,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Fifth Army Area)'—

"(1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike out '\$7,487,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,621,000'.

"(2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out '\$8,615,000' and insert in place thereof '\$9,893,000'.

"(3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike out '\$145,000' and insert in place thereof '\$193,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)'—with respect to various installations, strike out '\$3,014,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,204,000'.

"(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Outside Continental United States' in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Alaskan Area'—with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out '\$469,000' and insert in place thereof '\$559,000'.

"(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '\$225,277,000', '\$74,984,000', and '\$534,254,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$237,320,000', '\$75,074,000', and '\$546,387,000', respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended under the heading 'Inside the United States' in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Ordnance Corps)'—

"(1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out '\$88,000' and insert in place thereof '\$136,000'.

"(2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out '\$6,159,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,593,000'.

Under the subheading 'Technical Services Facilities (Quartermaster Corps)'—

"(1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike out '\$832,000' and insert in place thereof '\$984,000'.

"(2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot, Texas, strike out '\$1,285,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,847,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Field Forces Facilities'—

"(1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out '\$5,301,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,293,000'.

"(2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out '\$4,173,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,798,000'.

"(3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out '\$1,092,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,373,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, '\$200,783,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$203,331,000'.

"(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts '\$86,916,000', '\$200,783,000', and '\$323,462,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$95,010,000', '\$203,331,000', and '\$334,104,000', respectively.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing, permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock \$25,438,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$1,452,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for remedying effects of ground subsides, \$1,500,000.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, \$1,326,000.

"Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront facilities, \$544,000.

"Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,729,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"(Naval air training stations)

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, \$566,000.

"Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

"Naval Air Station, Glynnco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

"Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$13,387,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

"Naval Air Station, Pensacola: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

"Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

"(Fleet support air stations)

"Naval Air Stations, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

"Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

"Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,089,000.

"Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, California: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,310,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

"Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$5,728,000.

"Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

"Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$27,535,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, \$384,000.

"Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, \$3,401,000.

"Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities (Tactical Air Navigation facility), \$39,000.

"Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

"Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

"Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and utilities, \$9,448,000.

"Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

"(Marine Corps air stations)

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,503,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, \$3,620,000.

"Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California: Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

"(Special purpose air stations)

"Naval Air Development Center, Johnstown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

"Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$2,209,000.

"Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$7,669,000.

"Naval Air Facility, to be known as John H. Towers Field, and to be located at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, operational facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$3,200,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

"Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

"Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

"Marine Corps Facilities

"Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

"Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$6,841,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$2,372,000.

"Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, troop housing, messhall, and utilities, \$2,643,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

"Marine Corps School, Quantico, Virginia: Supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,923,000.

"Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

"Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

"Ordnance Facilities

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utilities, \$316,000.

"Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas: Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

"Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Maryland: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

"Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Utilities, \$236,000.

"Service School Facilities

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory foundations, \$1,602,000.

"Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

"Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$1,613,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$443,000.

"Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, \$100,000.

"Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

"Yards and Docks Facilities

"Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,000.

"Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,244,000.

"Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$759,000.

"Outside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$1,297,000.

"Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,750,000.

"Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, \$7,576,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, community facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.

"Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$332,000.

"Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,000.

"Aviation Facilities

"Naval Air Station, Agaña, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,000.

"Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and community facilities, \$1,793,000.

"Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$2,088,000.

"Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.

"Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational facilities, \$5,730,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.

"Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.

"Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities (tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.

"Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities at White Beach, \$504,000.

"Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities, \$1,550,000.

"Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, \$884,000.

"Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Supply facilities, \$397,000.

"Ordnance Facilities

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities, and land acquisition, \$326,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

"Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities: \$69,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$4,392,000.

"Yards and Dock Facilities

"Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

"Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$59,056,000.

"Sec. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 201, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Yards and Docks Facilities', with respect to 'Various locations', strike out '\$4,500,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,460,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 '\$86,397,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$95,489,000'.

"(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts '\$138,183,000', '\$86,397,000', and '\$256,875,000' and inserting respectively in place thereof, '\$139,143,000', '\$95,489,000', and '\$266,927,000'.

"Sec. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 201 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities' with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California, strike out '\$225,000' and insert in place thereof '\$369,000'; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, strike out '\$1,675,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,030,000'; and with respect to the Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out '\$70,000' and insert in place thereof '\$170,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202 '\$63,358,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$70,656,000'.

"(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '\$102,956,000', '\$63,358,000', '\$202,807,000' and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$103,555,000', '\$70,656,000', and '\$210,704,000'.

"SEC. 205 (a). Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 201 as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Shipyard Facilities', with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, California, strike out '\$629,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,099,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Fleet Base Facilities', with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out '\$399,000' and insert in place thereof '\$563,000'.

"(3) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities (Naval Air Training Stations)', with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out '\$3,686,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,292,000'; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, strike out '\$24,361,000' and insert in place thereof '\$26,871,000'.

"(4) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities (Fleet Support Air Stations)', with respect to the Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out '\$3,729,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,217,000'; with respect to the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out '\$2,581,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,355,000'; and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Florida, strike out '\$1,087,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,587,000'.

"(5) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)', with respect to the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out '\$16,311,000' and insert in place thereof '\$17,911,000'.

"(6) Under the subheading 'Ordnance Facilities', with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas, strike out '\$1,111,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,751,000'; and with respect to the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out '\$375,000' and insert in place thereof '\$475,000'.

"(7) Under the subheading 'Service School Facilities' with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, strike out '\$780,000' and insert in place thereof '\$879,000'.

"(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Outside Continental United States' in section 201 as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities' with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, strike out '\$4,411,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,235,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Communication Facilities', with respect to the Naval Communication Facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out '\$2,848,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,198,600'.

"(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 '\$151,342,400' and inserting in place thereof '\$152,763,400'.

"(d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking

out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '\$299,512,600', '\$107,191,300', '\$151,342,400', and '\$564,046,300' and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$308,463,600', '\$108,365,300', '\$152,763,400', and '\$575,592,300'.

"SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading, 'Inside the United States' in section 201, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Shipyard Facilities' with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out '\$148,000' and insert in place thereof '\$191,000'; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, strike out '\$5,984,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,169,000'.

"(2) Under the subheading 'Fleet Base Facilities', with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California, strike out '\$2,256,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,623,000'; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out '\$2,844,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,340,000'.

"(3) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities (Fleet Support Air Stations)', with respect to the Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out '\$8,835,000' and insert in place thereof '\$11,040,000'.

"(4) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities (Special Purpose Air Stations)', with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out '\$1,682,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,010,000'.

"(5) Under the subheading 'Service School Facilities' with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, strike out '\$7,469,000' and insert in place thereof '\$10,919,000'.

"(6) Under the subheading 'Communications Facilities', with respect to the Naval Communication Station, San Francisco, California, strike out '\$2,029,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,779,000'.

"(7) Under the subheading 'Yards and Docks Facilities', with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out '\$443,000' and insert in place thereof '\$500,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading 'Outside the United States' in section 201, as follows:

"(1) Under the subheading 'Aviation Facilities', with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike out '\$1,961,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,337,000'.

"(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 203, '\$84,043,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$85,939,000'.

"(d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts '\$292,572,000', '\$61,625,000', '\$84,043,000', and '\$438,240,000' and inserting respectively in place thereof '\$303,453,000', '\$62,001,000', '\$85,939,000', and '\$451,393,000'.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Air Defense Command

"Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

"Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

"Gelger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

"Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

"Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

"Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,100,000.

"Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$614,000.

"Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$429,000.

"K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$905,000.

"Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,299,000.

"McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$632,000.

"McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply facilities and community facilities, \$189,000.

"Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,804,000.

"Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$674,000.

"Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Family housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$559,000.

"Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,828,000.

"Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,768,000.

"Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Community facilities, \$244,000.

"Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

"Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

"Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

"Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvement, \$694,000.

"Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$956,000.

"Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$130,000.

"Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,153,000.

"Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$358,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$44,428,000.

"Air Material Command

"Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$10,410,000.

"Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

"Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$899,000.

"Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

"McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,912,000.

"Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

"Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$13,104,000.

"Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota: Community facilities, \$56,000.

"Tinker Air Force Base: Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

"Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,777,000.

"Air Proving Ground Command

"Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$5,826,000.

"Air Research and Development Command

"Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,987,000.

"Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

"Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada: Community facilities, \$206,000.

"Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,276,000.

"Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,469,000.

"Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,882,000.

"Air Training Command

"Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,872,000.

"Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

"Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Community facilities, \$262,000.

"Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,209,000.

"Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,848,000.

"Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, \$8,249,000.

"McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

"Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$938,000.

"Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community facilities, \$436,000.

"Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

"Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

"Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,909,000.

"Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$900,000.

"Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements, \$4,200,000.

"Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

"Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,977,000.

"Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$4,118,000.

"Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$865,000.

"Air University

"Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land acquisition, \$50,000.

"Continental Air Command

"Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical facilities, \$952,000.

"Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

"Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$337,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis, Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

"Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,216,000.

"Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$745,000.

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$496,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$848,000.

"Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,344,000.

"Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,458,000.

"Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,487,000.

"Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$5,557,000.

"Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

"Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,966,000.

"Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

"Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,076,000.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$536,000.

"Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$2,320,000.

"Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,361,000.

"Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$14,638,000.

"Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community facilities, \$100,000.

"Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$1,976,000.

"Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

"Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

"Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Texas: Community facilities, \$34,000.

"Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

"Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, \$380,000.

"Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

"Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

"Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$12,552,000.

"Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, \$250,000.

"Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land acquisition, \$37,000.

"Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,504,000.

"Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

"MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$936,000.

"Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

"March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

"Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

"Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$231,000.

"Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

"Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Community facilities, \$372,000.

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,937,000.

"Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

"Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,676,000.

"Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,901,000.

"Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$235,000.

"Tactical Air Command

"Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities,

utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,149,000.

"Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,287,000.

"England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,558,000.

"Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$683,000.

"George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

"Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Utilities and ground improvements, \$20,000.

"Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$1,204,000.

"Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Community facilities, \$484,000.

"Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$9,991,000.

"Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$229,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

"Outside the United States

"Alaskan Air Command

"Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$4,742,000.

"Ladd Air Force Base: Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$11,500,000.

"Air Materiel Command

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$247,000.

"Far East Air Forces

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,228,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,569,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,741,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

"Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities,

ties, and utilities and ground improvements, \$57,218,000.

"United States Air Forces in Europe

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$36,057,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$20,000,000.

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$47,000,000.

"SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Air Defense Command'—with respect to Pescadero Consolation Station, Pescadero, California, strike out '\$224,000' and insert in place thereof '\$584,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Strategic Air Command'—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out '\$11,393,000' and insert in place thereof '\$12,686,000'; and strike out '\$1,463,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,756,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Continental Air Command'—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York, strike out '\$729,000' and insert in place thereof '\$929,000'; and strike out '\$686,000' and insert in place thereof '\$886,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Research and Development Command'—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out '\$27,478,000' and insert in place thereof '\$29,442,000'; and strike out '\$16,192,000' and insert in place thereof '\$18,156,000'.

"(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 so much as reads '\$406,120,000' and '\$415,949,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$409,937,000' and '\$419,766,000', respectively.

"SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Air Defense Command'—

"(1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington, strike out '\$1,716,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,717,000';

"(2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Dakota, strike out '\$7,709,000' and insert in place thereof '\$9,220,000';

"(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out '\$2,029,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,195,000';

"(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out '\$6,630,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,268,000';

"(5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, California, strike out '\$2,445,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,935,000';

"(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out '\$5,526,000' and insert in place thereof '\$6,445,000';

"(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out

'\$742,000' and insert in place thereof '\$893,000';

"(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Arizona, strike out '\$2,107,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,676,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Materiel Command'—

"(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama, strike out '\$4,170,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,728,000';

"(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out '\$15,803,000' and insert in place thereof '\$16,654,000';

"(3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out '\$9,522,000' and insert in place thereof '\$11,970,000';

"(4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out '\$12,001,000' and insert in place thereof '\$14,508,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Training Command'—

"(1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas, strike out '\$3,438,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,876,000';

"(2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, strike out '\$4,081,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,088,000';

"(3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi, strike out '\$500,000' and insert in place thereof '\$545,000';

"(4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas, strike out '\$446,000' and insert in place thereof '\$529,000';

"(5) with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas, strike out '\$883,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,129,000';

"(6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out '\$1,516,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,998,000';

"(7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, strike out '\$1,076,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,304,000';

"(8) with respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out '\$1,215,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,556,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Headquarters Command'—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, strike out '\$520,000' and insert in place thereof '\$825,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Research and Development Command'—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada, strike out '\$555,500' and insert in place thereof '\$624,500'.

"Under the subheading 'Strategic Air Command'—

"(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, strike out '\$5,929,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,363,000';

"(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out '\$11,155,000' and insert in place thereof '\$12,218,000';

"(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out '\$9,769,000' and insert in place thereof '\$11,473,000';

"(4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out '\$6,657,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,324,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Tactical Air Command'—

"(1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out '\$2,684,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,527,000';

"(2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, strike out '\$559,000' and insert in place thereof '\$611,000';

"(3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, strike out '\$1,598,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,905,000';

"(4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington, strike out '\$4,724,000' and insert in place thereof '\$5,197,000';

"(5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out '\$3,589,000' and insert in place thereof '\$4,010,000'.

"(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading 'Outside Continental United States' in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading, 'Alaskan Air Command'—with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out '\$518,000' and insert in place thereof '\$735,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Area Control Navigational Aids'—with respect to various locations, strike out '\$526,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,394,000'.

"(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts '\$801,256,000', '\$532,454,000', and '\$1,339,060,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$824,300,000', '\$533,539,000', and '\$1,363,189,000', respectively.

"Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended, under the heading 'Continental United States' in section 301, as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Air Defense Command'—

"(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota, strike out '\$863,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,469,000';

"(2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington, strike out '\$2,827,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,079,000';

"(3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, strike out '\$2,470,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,080,000';

"(4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out '\$18,969,000' and insert in place thereof '\$30,521,000';

"(5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, strike out '\$1,673,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,781,000';

"(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out '\$2,156,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,336,000';

"(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out '\$1,130,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,560,000';

"(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out '\$21,215,000' and insert in place thereof '\$27,035,000';

"(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out '\$3,030,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,409,000';

"(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California, strike out '\$2,392,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,779,000';

"(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa, strike out '\$2,288,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,900,000';

"(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin, strike out '\$4,876,000' and insert in place thereof '\$8,726,000';

"(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out '\$3,278,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,808,000';

"(14) with respect to various locations, strike out '\$21,510,000' and insert in place thereof '\$26,201,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Materiel Command'—

"(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out '\$17,966,000' and insert in place thereof '\$22,005,000';

"(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out '\$473,000' and insert in place thereof '\$745,000';

"(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out '\$129,000' and insert in place thereof '\$251,000';

"(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out '\$5,990,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,763,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air Training Command'—

"(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out '\$17,121,000' and insert in place thereof '\$26,471,000';

"(2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama, strike out '\$18,000' and insert in place thereof '\$22,000';

"(3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out '\$24,433,000' and insert in place thereof '\$33,858,000';

"(4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada, strike out '\$2,221,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,063,000';

"(5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out '\$977,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,064,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Air University'—with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out '\$215,000' and insert in place thereof '\$311,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Continental Air Command'—

"(1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out '\$13,395,000' and insert in place thereof '\$15,993,000';

"(2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia, strike out '\$345,000' and insert in place thereof '\$500,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Research and Development Command'—

"(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out '\$6,939,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,530,000';

"(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out '\$5,488,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,220,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Strategic Air Command'—

"(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out '\$922,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,190,000';

"(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out '\$2,179,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,643,000';

"(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out '\$14,518,000' and insert in place thereof '\$15,322,000';

"(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out '\$943,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,075,000';

"(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out '\$1,694,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,966,000';

"(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out '\$4,952,000' and insert in place thereof '\$7,880,000';

"(7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out '\$1,236,000' and insert in place thereof '\$1,586,000';

"(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out '\$2,064,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,607,000';

"(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out '\$5,697,000' and insert in place thereof '\$6,155,000';

"(10) with respect to Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, strike out '\$1,491,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,027,000';

"(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out '\$661,000' and insert in place thereof '\$720,000';

"(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out '\$2,791,000' and insert in place thereof '\$3,181,000'.

"Under the subheading 'Tactical Air Command'—with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out '\$2,613,000' and insert in place thereof '\$2,785,000'.

"(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading 'Outside the United States' as follows:

"Under the subheading 'Northeast Air Command'—with respect to various locations, strike out '\$75,650,000' and insert in place thereof '\$94,197,000'.

"(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts '\$742,873,000', '\$405,061,000', and '\$1,360,934,000' and inserting in place thereof '\$811,342,000', '\$423,608,000', and '\$1,447,950,000', respectively.

"SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

"TITLE IV—FAMILY HOUSING

"SEC. 401. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installation for which family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

"SEC. 402. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

"SEC. 403. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

"(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 404. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the

Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

"(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

"(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less."

"SEC. 405. The second paragraph of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allowances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental charges collected from personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition."

"SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units (other than housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act.

"(b) Effective July 1, 1958, the provisions of section 419, Public Law 968, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 407. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate quarters under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services, notwithstanding that such quarters may have been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters. The net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of such quarters shall be paid from otherwise available appropriations.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall be administered under regulations approved by the President.

"(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Secretary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the "Secretaries"), are each authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to (b) above, to designate as rental housing such housing as he may determine to be inadequate as public quarters.

"(d) The Secretaries are each further authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to subsection (b) above, to lease inadequate housing to personnel of any of the mentioned services for occupancy by them and their dependents. The housing facilities leased, as herein provided, shall

not be required to have been constructed with funds derived from appropriations specifically made for the purpose of the construction of rental housing for personnel of the services mentioned.

"(e) All housing units determined pursuant to subsection (c) of this section to be inadequate shall, prior to July 1, 1960, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of.

"(f) This section shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of Title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

"TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

"(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$115,624,000; outside the United States, \$34,477,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$293,103,000;

"(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$230,574,000; outside the United States, \$48,199,000; section 202, \$59,056,000; or a total of \$337,611,000; and

"(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$394,076,000; outside the United States, \$160,705,000; section 302, \$47,000,000; or a total of \$601,781,000.

"SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

"SEC. 504. Whenever—

"(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

"(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

"SEC. 505. Contracts made by the United States under this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts

awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

"SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefore, that are contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

"(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

"(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

"(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

"(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231-2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

"(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

"(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

"(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

"SEC. 507. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at an average nationwide unit cost in excess of—

"(a) \$28 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

"(b) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;

"(c) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

"(d) \$7,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters,

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitation on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

"SEC. 508. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure '\$126,000,000' and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$135,425,000'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
STERLING COLE,
LEON H. GAVIN,
WALTER NORBLAD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On July 10, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 8240, which was the fiscal year 1958 military construction and authorization for the three military departments. On August 12, 1957, the Senate passed H. R. 8240, amended.

The larger differences and the action agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

ARMY

In title I, the Army section of the bill, there were several items in disagreement. Some of them resulted from the decision of the executive branch to lower its budget request subsequent to the House hearings on H. R. 8240. To these changes by the Senate, the House found itself in substantial agreement.

Upon completion of the conference on title I of the bill, the Senate receded with respect to the item involving Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and the House receded with respect to the provision of a gas-heating system for Fort Devens, Mass.

Among the deficiency authorizations for the Army, the committee had raised the authorization for the hospital at Fort Jackson, S. C., from \$5,000,000 to \$10,400,000. It was the decision of the conferees that the higher figure should be \$7,500,000, an amount sufficient to provide a wholly usable hospital facility for this installation.

NAVY

In similar fashion, for budgetary or funding reasons, a large number of the Navy items were lowered or eliminated by the Senate. Most of these items which are not to be funded were accepted in their modified form by the House conferees.

Upon completion of the conference of title II of the bill, the Senate receded with respect to the item involving the construction of a pier at the naval air station, Pensacola, Fla., and also in the case of the Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif., where \$209,000 was added to the Senate figure for items relating to the extension of a runway. The Senate also receded, in part, for the Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C., in order that one of the two requested headquarters buildings might be constructed. At the Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, S. C., the Senate receded in order that provision might be made for barracks and other needed facilities. \$48,000 was added to the Senate figure for the Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va., for utilities. With respect to the Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Va., the House accepted the Senate figure.

The Senate had deleted \$270,000 at the Marine Corps Training Center, Twenty-Nine Palms, Calif. Subsequent investigation by both committees revealed that the soil stabilization which would be performed under this authority was an urgently required item and the Senate receded.

Similarly, subsequent investigation by both committees revealed the importance of the work contemplated at the Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex., and at the Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Md. The Senate, therefore, receded with respect to these two items. In Okinawa, certain waterfront facilities necessary at White Beach were restored in conference, with the Senate receding.

The House had allowed \$199,000 for operational facilities at the naval auxiliary air station, Edenton, N. C., while the Senate had allowed only \$160,000. In conference, it was

determined that the item in its entirety should be stricken.

The House receded in connection with the naval air station, Lemoore, Calif., permitting the Senate reduction of approximately 10 percent to stand. The House also receded with respect to the increased amount granted for the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.

Other items which were the subject of recession by the House involved, for the most part, construction items which would not be funded during fiscal year 1958.

The Congress is familiar with the long legislative history involved in the provision of a flying facility for the Naval Academy. Again this year the matter came up for congressional consideration and the House inserted an item authorizing the acquisition of land for such a facility to be named John H. Towers Field (location undetermined). The Senate version of the bill contained no similar authority. Recent studies by both committees have revealed that Andrews Air Force Base would provide an apparently feasible and acceptable site for the now somewhat enlarged functions contemplated by the Navy. The conferees decided, therefore, to insert the following language which, in essence, preserves the thinking of both the House and the Senate:

"Naval Air Facility, to be known as John H. Towers Field, and to be located at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md., operational facilities, utilities, and ground improvement, \$3,200,000."

The conferees urge both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force to arrive at a prompt agreement for the use of such facilities at Andrews Air Force Base, and urge the Navy to proceed expeditiously in planning for such construction or modification as may be necessary to enable this facility to see early operation.

AIR FORCE

The House conferees found themselves in only minor disagreement with the Senate action on title III, the Air Force section of the bill. Again, as was the case with respect to the other two military departments, budgetary and funding considerations made reasonable the deletion or lowering of certain of the items and the House, therefore, receded with respect to a large number of these changes.

At the conclusion of the conference on title III of the bill, the Senate receded with respect to an exchange facility at Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., the provision of a commissary at the Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, and all items at the Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.

At Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga., the Senate figure was raised in order to grant authority for the construction of a primary runway and its attendant taxiway.

The House receded with respect to the provision of a dormitory at Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass., and the provision of an exchange facility at Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.

Virtually all of the other recessions by the House involved items which are not to be funded during fiscal year 1958.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Most of the general provisions in both the Senate and the House versions of the bill were identical. There were, however, some fundamental differences. These differences were found in sections 406 and 407 of the Senate bill.

Section 406 contained no counterpart in the House bill. It was designed, the House conferees were informed, to require that all housing, from whatever source, should be the subject of line item justification in military construction bills enacted after July 1, 1958. After extended discussion, the conferees agreed that the language should be modified in such fashion as to eliminate the appli-

cability of the section to Wherry housing and, specifically, to render certain that Wherry housing would be acquired at any installation where Capehart housing is planned for construction.

The other section which was in substantial disagreement, section 407 of the Senate version, related to the granting of an authority for the occupancy of inadequate quarters on a rental basis, as distinguished from the surrender of an individual's whole housing allowance. The House conferees insisted on amendments which would (1) limit the housing affected to family quarters; (2) require that all housing determined to be inadequate should, prior to July 1, 1960, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished, or otherwise disposed of; (3) exclude so-called Wherry housing from the applicability of the section; and (4) require that the net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of the quarters be paid from otherwise available appropriations.

Section 506 of the Senate version, and its House counterpart, of the bill rescinds existing authorizations after they have been in existence for 4 years, and contains certain exceptions. Among these exceptions in the House version of the bill was that relating to the authorizations of the rental guaranty for family housing that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, 82d Congress. The Senate version did not include this exception. After deliberation, the conferees agreed that this exception should be included and the Senate receded.

Section 411 of the House bill, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, in effect, required that the Secretary of Defense inform the Senate and the House of Representatives, whenever it was proposed to terminate or reduce the operations of any commercial- or industrial-type activity where such activity had been in operation for 5 or more years and required the services of 10 or more civilian employees, and the supplies or services furnished by such activity were to be furnished by other than civilian employees of the United States. After deliberation, the House receded with respect to this section.

Section 412 of the House version of the bill, which similarly found no counterpart in the Senate version, prohibited the use of the national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, as a basis for negotiated contracts, as distinguished from competitive bidding. The section contained certain exceptions to this limitation.

While both the Senate and House conferees were in very substantial agreement that the end to be achieved was a proper one, it was decided that action to this end should be embodied in separate legislation and the House, therefore, receded.

The Senate version of the bill contains cost limitations with respect to cold storage and regular warehousing, permanent barracks, and bachelor officer quarters. The House receded with respect to this section.

The Senate and the House were in disagreement with respect to the amount of additional authority which should be granted for the Air Force Academy. The House on the one hand agreed that a flying facility should be provided at the Academy site while the Senate felt that another airfield in that area could be used for this activity. The House conferees felt that at least on a temporary basis, other flying facilities could be used and therefore receded.

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy, and Air Force titles totaled \$1,416,573,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version totaled \$1,203,413,000 or \$213,165,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, and III is \$1,232,495,000. This latter sum is \$184,078,000

less than the House version and \$29,082,000 more than the Senate version.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
STERLING COLE,
LEON H. GAVIN,
WALTER NORBLAD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR PRESERVATION OF COMPETITIVE THROUGH ROUTES FOR RAIL CARRIERS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5384) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the preservation of competitive through routes for rail carriers, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (3) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (49 U. S. C. 15 (3)), is amended by striking out the last full sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sentence: "No through route shall be canceled—or commercially closed—by tariff adjustments except by agreement of all carriers whose lines are embraced therein, unless the Commission shall, upon application by the proponent or proponents and after hearing, find that such cancellation, or commercial closing, is consistent with the public interest without regard to the provisions of paragraph (4) of this section, and the burden of proof shall be upon the carrier or carriers proposing such cancellation, or commercial closing, to show that the cancellation or commercial closing, is consistent with public interest, without regard to the provisions of paragraph (4) of this section. For the purposes of this paragraph, a route shall be regarded as commercially closed if the rate applicable over it on a particular commodity or description of traffic is higher than on like traffic over another route, from and to the same points, in which one or more of such carriers participate, by an amount which in the ordinary course of business restrains movements of traffic over such route."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill H. R. 5384 is brought to you unanimously by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to amend section 15 (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act by providing that no through route shall be canceled, as in the present law, or commercially closed, as added by this bill, by tariff adjustments, except by agreement of all carriers, parties to the tariff, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, upon application and after hearing, find that such cancellation or commercial closing is consistent with the public interest.

Section 15 (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act now provides that the Com-

mission may suspend for investigation any tariff or schedule which, without the consent of all carriers thereto, or authorized by the Commission, cancels any through route, rate, fare, charges, or classification.

Our committee held hearings on the bill. There is a division of thinking within the railroad industry itself. In fact, this bill is sponsored by the Short-line Railroad Association and at least part of the large railroads are in opposition to it.

During the hearings by the committee a number of railroads, especially the short lines, testified that while the present provision would perhaps be helpful in preservation of through routes, in recent years some rail carriers have attempted by various methods to circumvent the limitations imposed.

That is the crux of this bill.

A frequently used method is that of carrier publication—without consent of all carriers parties to existing routes over which the traffic is moving—of new through rates—lower and more attractive to shippers—which would not apply over all of the old through routes. No attempt is made to cancel the old joint rates, or the through routes to which the rates apply, but one or more through routes available to the shipper are omitted from the new tariff. From a practical standpoint, the omitted routes are commercially closed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Specifically, what does the gentleman mean by a through route?

Mr. HARRIS. That means that you have more than one road involved. As an example, on a shipment from here to Richmond, Va., by one road and from there to Durham, N. C., for example, by another road there must be through routes, there being more than one railroad involved. I think the gentleman understands.

Mr. GROSS. I am not sure that I do, but I will listen to the gentleman for his further explanation.

Mr. HARRIS. Let us use another example, that of a shipment from Washington to St. Louis, Mo., over one route, that is, over a particular road. That shipment is on its way to California. After it gets to St. Louis it must be taken by another road, Union Pacific, let us say, to California.

Now, when the tariffs are published before the Interstate Commerce Commission they publish these joint through routes; in other words, all the way from Washington to California. That is what I mean by referring to joint routes.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. As the gentleman has indicated, there is considerable opposition to this bill. I understand the American Association of Railroads, for instance, is opposed to the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; they appeared before the committee in opposition to it.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 21, 1957
For actions of August 20, 1957
85th-1st, No. 151

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,24	Fiscal policy.....26	Poultry inspection.....1
Atomic energy.....3,17	Fisheries.....7	Public Law 480.....2,24
Commodity exchanges.....12	Foreign aid.....24,29	REA loans.....9,28
Conservation.....1	Forestry.....1,10	Reclamation.....6,10,16
Cotton.....13	Industrial uses.....37	Research.....1,37
Dairy products.....20	Insect control.....1	Rice.....7
Disaster relief.....13	Interest rates.....28	Rural development.....18
Egg prices.....31	Lands.....10,15	Security.....4
Electrification	Legislative program.....27	Seed.....13
.....9,10,17,23,36	Military construction....2	Trade, foreign....14,20,25
Family farm.....34	Monopolies.....27	Transportation....5,22,27
Farm income.....30	Nominations.....33	Water resources.....11
Farm loans.....9	Onions.....12	Wheat.....8
Farm program.....18	Packers and Stockyards..27	Wool.....14,21
Fiber.....21	Personnel..4,5,19,27,32,35	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on bill to exempt from quotas wheat used on farm where produced. House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee announced it had annulled proposed favorable report on onion futures bill. Senate committee reported bills to sell surplus cotton to U.S. mills, and to provide for greater State participation in disaster relief. Sens. Humphrey and Carroll criticized Secretary for failure to testify on REA loan authority; Sen. Allott defended Secretary.

HOUSE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1958. Received the conference report on this bill, H.R. 9131 (H. Rept. 1207) (pp. 14026-30). As reported the bill provides \$4 million for ARS for eradication of screwworms and fireants (instead of \$5 million as proposed by the Senate). The amount of \$3.5 million added by the Senate for poultry inspection was reported in disagreement, but the statement of the House managers says a motion will be offered to concur with the Senate amendment, with an amendment to provide \$1,300,000 instead of \$3.5 million as proposed by the Senate. The item of \$25 million for emergency conservation measures was reported in disagreement. The item to authorize the use of not to exceed \$50,000 of the funds appropriated for forest land management in 1958 for the acquisition of sites for buildings outside the national forests with other limitation, was reported in disagreement.
2. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 8240, the military housing construction authorization bill, including a provision for the use of foreign currencies acquired under Public Law 480 for the construction of military family housing units in foreign countries (pp. 14030-34). This bill will now be sent to the President.

3. ATOMIC ENERGY. Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 8996, authorizing appropriations for the AEC to acquire or construct power reactor facilities (pp. 14037-42). The report had been submitted by the conference committee earlier (H. Rept. 1204)(p. 14054).
 4. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment S. 1411, to give agencies discretion in either suspending or retaining on duty a Federal employee prior to security hearings (H. Rept. 1201). p. 14054
 5. STATION TRANSFERS. A subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee ordered reported S. 1408, to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the U.S. who are transferred from one official station to another. p. D806
 6. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1996, to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District and to provide that the excess-land provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to the lands of the Kendrick project, Wyo.. p. D807
 7. RICE; FISHERIES. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1552, to develop methods for the commercial production of fish on flooded rice acreage in rotation with rice field crop. p. D807
- SENATE
8. WHEAT. Agreed to the conference report on S. 959, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm where produced (See Digest 149). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13984-5
 9. REA LOANS. Sens. Humphrey, Carroll, Morton, Allott, and Aiken discussed the alleged change in REA loan authority, which Sen. Humphrey contended was a violation of the Secretary's promises when the Reorganization Act was adopted, and Sen. Carroll charged was a basic change in policy violating the REA Act. Sen. Allott defended the Secretary. pp. 13998-14005, 14006-8
 10. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Passed with an amendment S. 2757, to authorize construction of the Burns Creek Project, Ida.. The amendment, by Sen. Anderson, provided that all lands acquired within the exterior boundaries of a national forest and not used by the project shall become national forest lands. pp. 13995, 13997-8
 11. WATER RESOURCES. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 2431, granting Congressional consent to the Ore.-Calif. compact on the Klamath River Basin. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13992
At the request of Sen. Talmadge, passed over S. Con. Res. 28, to authorize the compilation and printing of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River. p. 13947
Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau plans for improvement works on the Bayou Nexipique watershed, La., and the Alamo Arroyo and Diablo Arroyo watershed, Tex.. pp. 13919, 14054
 12. ONIONS. The Daily Digest states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee annulled its proposed favorable report without amendment on S. 778, to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges. p. D804

of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 866, 867), for Chiefs of Mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsection (b) or subsection (c) of this section as a delegate or representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Conference shall be entitled to receive such compensation. Any person who receives compensation pursuant to the provisions of this subsection may be granted allowances and benefits not to exceed those received by Chiefs of Mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance.

"Sec. 3. The participation of the United States in the International Atomic Energy Agency shall be consistent with and in furtherance of the purposes of the Agency set forth in its Statute and the policy concerning the development, use, and control of atomic energy set forth in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress on the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and on the participation of the United States therein. In addition to any other requirements of law, the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission shall keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as appropriate, currently informed with respect to the activities of the Agency and the participation of the United States therein.

"Sec. 4. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the organs of the Agency, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

"Sec. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the International Atomic Energy Agency as apportioned by the Agency in accordance with paragraph (D) of article XIV of the Statute of the Agency, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended; salaries as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, or as authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); translating and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section II of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); official functions and courtesies; such sums as may be necessary to defray the expenses of United States participation in the Preparatory Commission for the Agency, established pursuant to annex I of the Statute of the Agency; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State.

"Sec. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order or regulation, a Federal employee who, with the approval of the Federal agency or the head of the department by which he is employed, leaves his position to enter the employ of the Agency shall not be considered for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, as separated from his Federal position during such employment with the Agency but not to extend beyond the first three consecutive years of his entering the employ of the Agency: *Provided*, (1) That he shall pay to the Civil Service Commission within ninety days from the date he is separated without prejudice from the Agency all necessary deductions and agency contributions for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the period of his employment by the Agency, and (2) That all deductions and agency contributions necessary for continued coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be made during the term of his employment with the International Atomic Energy Agency. If such employee, within three years from the date of his employment with the Agency, and within ninety days from the date he is separated without prejudice from the Agency, applies to be restored to his Federal position, he shall within thirty days of such application be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status and pay.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order or regulation, any Presidential appointee or elected officer who leaves his position to enter, or who within ninety days after the termination of his position enters, the employ of the Agency, shall be entitled to the coverage and benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, but not beyond the earlier of either the termination of his employment with the Agency or the expiration of three years from the date he entered employment with the Agency: *Provided*, (1) That he shall pay to the Civil Service Commission within ninety days from the date he is separated without prejudice from the Agency all necessary deductions and agency contributions for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the period of his employment by the Agency, and (2) That all deductions and agency contributions necessary for continued coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be made during the term of his employment with the Agency.

"(c) The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and to protect the retirement, insurance and such other civil service rights and privileges as the President may find appropriate.

"Sec. 7. Section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding the following new sentences: 'Unless hereafter otherwise authorized by law the Commission shall be compensated for special nuclear material so distributed at not less than the Commission's published charges applicable to the domestic distribution of such material, except that the Commission to assist and encourage research on peaceful uses or for medical therapy may so distribute without charge during any calendar year only a quantity of such material which at the time of transfer does not exceed in value \$10,000 in the case of one nation or \$50,000 in the case of any group of nations. The Commission may distribute to the International Atomic Energy Agency, or to any group of nations, only such amounts of special nuclear materials and for such periods of time as are authorized by Congress: *Provided*,

however, That, notwithstanding this provision, the Commission is hereby authorized subject to the provisions of section 123, to distribute to the Agency five thousand kilograms of contained uranium-235, together with the amounts of special nuclear material which will match in amount the sum of all quantities of special nuclear materials made available by all other members of the Agency to July 1, 1960.'

"Sec. 8. In the event of an amendment to the Statute of the Agency being adopted in accordance with article XVIII-C of the Statute to which the Senate by formal vote shall refuse its advice and consent, upon notification by the Senate to the President of such refusal to advise and consent, all further authority under section 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this Act, as amended, shall terminate: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of State, under such regulations as the President shall promulgate, shall have the necessary authority to complete the prompt and orderly settlement of obligations and commitments to the Agency already incurred and pay salaries, allowances, travel expenses, and other expenses required for a prompt and orderly termination of United States participation in the Agency: *And provided further*, That the representative and the deputy representative of the United States to the Agency, and such other officers or employees representing the United States in the Agency, under such regulations as the President shall promulgate, shall retain their authority under this Act for such time as may be necessary to complete the settlement of matters arising out of the United States participation in the Agency" and the Senate agree to the same.

CARL T. DURHAM,
MELVIN PRICE,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
STERLING COLE,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALBERT GORE,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
HENRY DWORSHAK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8992) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in that Agency, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The main matter in dispute between the House and the Senate was the desirability of requiring that other amounts of materials beyond the amount tentatively offered to the Agency by the President in his message of October 26, 1956, should be transferred only after congressional authorization. The Senate members of the conference insisted that this requirement would have been written into the Resolution of Ratification if it had not been certain that it would have gone into the Participation Act. There is no doubt in the minds of Members of the House of the importance of having congressional control of some kind over the materials to be transferred. While it was the thought of the House Members that there were already adequate controls for this purpose in the Atomic Energy Act, the House Members receded from

their objections when the amendment was broadened so as to include all international agencies and not to single out just the International Atomic Energy Agency. In addition, the language of the requirement for congressional authorization is broadened to require the Congress indicate the time limit on the authorization. This was done in order to negate any idea in other nations that the congressional authorization would be required for either single years or single projects.

CARL T. DURHAM,
MELVIN PRICE,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
STERLING COLE,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 8992.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this conference report has not been printed; therefore, it is not in conformance with the rules of the House for the matter to be under consideration at this time. Is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. That is the reason the gentleman from North Carolina is asking unanimous consent to take it up now.

Mr. GROSS. Is any printed information available?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no information on that. The Chair is simply putting a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. GROSS. I withhold the objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE. What the gentleman says is right; the printed report is not available, but I am sure the explanation that will be given to the gentleman will satisfy him that the work of the conferees is entirely acceptable.

Mr. GROSS. May I have the assurance of the gentleman from North Carolina that the conference report will be explained so that the House may know what changes were made in conference?

Mr. DURHAM. I will try to do that.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the implementing legislation for the treaty which was signed some weeks ago in regard to the international organization. The difference between the House and the other body was on the so-called Bricker amendment. The Bricker amendment put a limitation

in the bill. The President, as we all recall, first obligated 5,000 kilograms of this material to the International Agency to begin with. Under the treaty, of course, there are, I believe, 82 nations which will meet in Geneva to finally organize this agency in October. The safeguards that the committee put around this Agency and which were of some concern to Members of the House and the Members of the other body, I think, are adequate. The State Department at first objected to part of the Bricker amendment. In revising the amendment, we made it so that all of the international organizations which participate in this material such as Euratom and under our bilateral agreements, they will all be treated alike. The committee felt, of course, that it was the best procedure to try to treat them all alike in the distribution of this material. We do not give this material away, except for small grants for research purposes. It is sold at the prevailing price, which is about \$16,000 a kilogram. That, in substance, explains the conference report as far as I know.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina has explained, this conference report relates to the bill which is called the participation act making it possible for our Government to designate a member of the Board of Governors which will direct the International Atomic Energy Agency and for that representative of our Government to engage whatever personnel he may need to carry out that responsibility. There was an amendment, a sentence added to the bill by the Joint Committee which, in the minds of some of us, was highly objectionable. The effect of that amendment was, with respect to the International Agency, with the exception of the amounts heretofore promised by the President of fissionable material and special nuclear material, that hereafter the Congress would have to pass an act authorizing the transfer of any additional amounts. That was felt to be discriminatory against the Agency and too restrictive to permit the Agency to operate in a reasonable program. The conferees worked out a compromise which seems to have accomplished all that the so-called Bricker amendment sought to accomplish, but at the same time removing some of the discriminatory aspects and its limitations. It is now worded so that the Commission may distribute to the International Agency or to any other group of nations only those amounts of special nuclear material and for such periods of time as the Congress may designate. So that as it is now worded, both the amounts of material and the periods of time under which those amounts may be sold to the Agency are retained in the hands of the Congress. It indicates that the Congress may, by appropriate act, authorize the sale of whatever quantity the Congress feels reasonable and for whatever period of time the Agency may need to use that material. So there is a reasonably acceptable compromise from both viewpoints. I urge that the conference report be accepted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This bill provides for participation in the international organization?

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Were any further safeguards provided, strengthening the ability of this international organization to control fissionable material?

Mr. COLE. Whatever additional safeguards may be added would not be appropriate for the participation act, because the statute which has been ratified by the required number of countries covers the operation of the agency itself. It contains safeguards appropriate for the inspection of the operations of the agency, to make sure that there is no diversion of this material to nonpeaceful purposes, and provides for penalties and sanctions in case of violation of the commitment.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may disagree, but one of my reasons for opposing the bill was that there were not adequate safeguards set up in the international statute despite the inspection provisions, and so forth and so on.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman should know that our Government is now engaged in making bilateral agreements with individual countries in which our Government retains the right of inspection for the purpose of safety and health of the people, and to prevent diversion. Those very same safeguards are contained in the statute of the international organization.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1957

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8240) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House, August 19, 1957.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly the conference report on H. R. 8240, the military construction bill for fiscal year 1958. As you are aware, the Senate took the House bill and struck all language after the enacting clause.

As the bill passed the House, the authorities granted in the Army, Navy,

and Air Force titles totaled \$1,416,573,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version totaled \$1,203,413,000 or \$213,165,000 less than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, and III is \$1,232,495,000. This latter sum is \$184,078,000 less than the House version and \$29,082,000 more than the Senate version. The House has appropriated \$1,475,000,000 for the projects authorized in this bill and for authorizations granted in prior years.

There were some rather important differences in the general provisions of the bill. For example, section 411 of the House bill would require a resolution of one of the Houses to prevent the Secretary of Defense from closing down on industrial or commercial type activity under certain circumstances. The House receded with respect to this section.

Section 412 of the House bill would have prevented the use of the national emergency as a basis for negotiated contracts. I might say with respect to this section that the Senate and House conferees were in complete agreement that legislation of this kind appears necessary, but it was agreed that separate legislation should be used for this purpose.

The Senate version of the bill contained authority for the occupancy of substandard housing by military personnel on a rental basis and without loss of housing allowance. The House version contained no such provision. The House, however, earlier this year had passed a separate bill covering this matter. The language in the Senate construction bill was at considerable variance from this bill passed by the House. In conference, the Senate agreed to language which is virtually identical to the substandard bill as it had passed the House. Under the version accepted by the conferees, no Wherry housing can be declared substandard.

The Senate version also had a section 406 which would require that all housing, from whatever source, and under whatever law, would be the subject of a specific line item in the military construction bill. The House version had no such provision. The conferees agreed that the Senate version should be accepted with an amendment. The amendment eliminates from the applicability of the section to Wherry housing which is located at installations where Capehart housing is to be constructed.

I wish to make it entirely clear that this section does not repeal any existing law. All the current housing programs of the various services continue exactly as they are today through June 30, 1958. After that time, in order to maintain a single unified view of all military housing, the section will require that individual line items be included in the construction bill covering all housing from whatever source.

It might be asked why the clearance procedure with the committee which is in force today, is not sufficient. To this I would answer that it is obviously more effective and more efficient if the committee can check housing requirements

at installations at the same time that it is considering the other construction items at that installation. Also with recent cuts and rumors of further cuts in personnel strength an even greater control must be exercised over the housing to be built for our military people in order that we will not find ourselves with vacant family houses at or near military installations.

In effect, then, the change made by the House will require that wherever Capehart housing is to be constructed the Wherry housing must be acquired.

I will file in the RECORD today a State breakdown of all installations indicating the results of the conference.

CAPEHART HOUSING

I do not think the gentleman needs to be at all concerned about the effect of this section on Capehart housing. The House Armed Services Committee has already passed on over 90,000 units of Capehart housing and given its favorable consideration of it.

Between now and next July, a period of almost a year, it would be my judgment that the departments will have firmed up their plans and submitted virtually all of the additional projects which they hope to build. And I can say that wherever the housing is really needed, the House Armed Services Committee will continue as it has in the past and approve these projects.

I might say also that the statement which I have just made in presenting the conference report is wholly consistent with statements made yesterday on the floor of the Senate concerning the effect of section 406 on housing to be constructed under the Capehart law.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. As I understand, the only change in that part of the act is that after July 1, 1958, the military in the event they desire to build Capehart or title VIII housing will first have to present their needs to the House Armed Services Committee when you consider the military construction bill.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RAINS. But now the operation is that you have a kind of veto over them after they bring them in. Is that not it?

Mr. VINSON. We must clear them in 180 days.

Mr. RAINS. One other question, I noticed the gentleman said that no change had to do with the mandatory requirement of Wherry housing.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. RAINS. But I notice that the gentleman said in his remarks, if I did not misunderstand him, up until 1958—

Mr. VINSON. No; that is permanent, that stands. In other words, so the House and the public can understand it, no Capehart houses can be built at any installation where there are Wherry houses until the Wherry houses have been acquired, or are in the process of acquisition.

Mr. RAINS. One other question or comment. Then, I am sure, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia would not think that there is anything in this

conference report that would adversely affect the program of Capehart housing, would he?

Mr. VINSON. Up to date, as I said, the House committee and the Senate committee have approved 90,000 units of Capehart housing.

Mr. RAINS. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt I would like to say at this particular point that since January 1957 there have been 20,663 Capehart houses actually started. This I think is a fine record.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. Between now and next July there is almost a year, and in that time the Departments will have presented their plans, submitted what projects they need; but as far as the law is concerned it stands that they have the authority to build Capehart houses. All we are doing is requiring them to come before the committees and Congress in a bill of this kind authorizing Capehart houses to be constructed.

Mr. RAINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I should like to have the assurance of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia on one point. I have read what is included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday with reference to section 406 (a), on page 13880, and likewise with reference to section 406 at the bottom of page 13881. It is not necessary for me to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that the need for adequate military housing is urgent. Furthermore, the gentleman from Georgia is aware, I am sure, that 15 units of Capehart housing are being built for every unit built with appropriated funds. The contrast is great indeed. What I would like from the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, is assurance that there is nothing in this report which will tend to slow up the construction of Capehart military housing.

Mr. VINSON. There is nothing in this report that interferes with the method of authorization of Capehart houses until 1958, in July. After that, instead of having a clearance by the committee, as I just stated to the gentleman from Alabama, they must be cleared in a military construction bill. That will not slow them up because by that time most of the units will be, no doubt, authorized by the committee.

Mr. TALLE. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that this conference report is \$184 million less than the House version of the bill?

Mr. VINSON. To give the figures, when it passed the House there was provided \$1,416,573,000. When it passed the Senate it was \$1,203,413,000 or \$213,165,000 less than the House bill. The conferees agreed on a figure of \$1,232,495,000, which is \$184,078,000 less than

the House version or \$29,082,000 more than the Senate version.

Mr. GROSS. Where was the cutback effected principally, if in any particular item?

Mr. VINSON. They went all through the bill because after the House had finished its consideration of the bill and before we took it up in conference, the Department reexamined their authorization and requested that some \$200 million in authorizations be deleted. We did not delete it in the House bill because we knew that the Senate would follow the New Look of the Department of Defense. That is what they did and that is what accounts for this decrease.

Mr. GROSS. How much was in the House version of the bill for the flying field at the new Air Force Academy?

Mr. VINSON. I do not have that right before me, but that has been reduced. When it was called up in conference someone remarked that this is the item the gentleman was interested in.

Mr. GROSS. I am not speaking about Grandview, Mo. I am speaking about the new Air Academy.

Mr. VINSON. We stand at the Senate figure on that, which was about \$12 million under the House version.

Mr. GROSS. There will be a field built out there?

Mr. VINSON. No; no field for the time being is to be built. I will file the State breakdown at this point.

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal year 1958, continental United States

ALABAMA	
Army:	
Anniston Ordnance Depot	\$2,015,000
Fort Rucker	7,549,000
Air Force:	
Craig AFB, Selma	2,193,000
Maxwell 3FB, Montgomery	300,000
Total	12,057,000

ARIZONA	
Army: Fort Huachuca	1,936,000
Air Force:	
Davis-Monthan AFB, Tucson	2,361,000
Luke AFB, Phoenix	1,848,000
Williams AFB, Chandler	865,000
Total	7,010,000

ARKANSAS	
Air Force: Blytheville AFB, Blytheville	11,516,000

CALIFORNIA	
Army:	
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	130,000
Fort MacArthur	1,192,000
Fort Ord	3,307,000
Presidio of San Francisco	120,000
Sharpe General Depot	110,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Alameda	185,000
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	6,841,000
Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing	39,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro	4,310,000
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	3,620,000
Naval Air Station, Lemoore	27,535,000
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach	1,500,000
Naval Station, Long Beach	544,000
Naval Air Station, Miramar	3,401,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal year 1958, continental United States—Continued

CALIFORNIA	
Navy—Continued	
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave	\$3,281,000
Naval Air Station, North Island	7,964,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	1,469,000
Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu	7,669,000
Naval Magazine, Port Chicago	236,000
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme	759,000
Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente	9,448,000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego	116,000
Naval Training Center, San Diego	1,613,000
Naval Communication Station, San Diego	100,000
Naval Communication Center, Stockton	460,000
Marine Corps Training Center, 29 Palms	2,331,000
Air Force:	
Beale AFB, Marysville	7,458,000
Castle AFB, Merced	2,076,000
Edwards AFB, Muroc	1,987,000
George AFB, Victorville	2,478,000
Hamilton AFB, San Rafael	614,000
March AFB, Riverside	2,372,000
Mather AFB, Sacramento	8,249,000
McClellan AFB, Sacramento	4,912,000
Oxnard AFB, Oxnard	1,828,000
Travis AFB, Fairfield	1,937,000
Total	122,191,000

COLORADO	
Army:	
Fort Carson	1,049,000
Fitzsimons Army Hospital	937,000
Air Force: Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs	11,916,000
Total	13,902,000

CONNECTICUT	
Navy: Naval Submarine Base, New London	2,966,000

DELAWARE	
Air Force: Dover AFB, Dover	745,000

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Army: Walter Reed Army Medical Center	1,920,000

FLORIDA	
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field	5,089,000
Naval Air Station, Jacksonville	39,000
Naval Air Station, Key West	1,456,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport	384,000
Naval Air Station, Pensacola	6,225,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field	39,000
Air Force:	
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso	5,826,000
Homestead AFB, Homestead	380,000
MacDill AFB, Tampa	936,000
Patrick AFB, Cocoa	2,882,000
Pinecastle AFB, Orlando	3,271,000
Tyndall AFB, Panama City	3,186,000
Total	29,713,000

GEORGIA	
Army:	
Fort Benning	1,583,000
Atlanta General Depot	595,000
Fort Stewart	3,691,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal year 1958, continental United States—Continued

GEORGIA	
Navy:	
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany	\$140,000
Naval Air Station, Glynnco	293,000
Air Force:	
Dobbins AFB, Marietta	247,000
Hunter AFB, Savannah	994,000
Moody AFB, Valdosta	938,000
Robins AFB, Macon	13,104,000
Turner AFB, Albany	8,628,000
Total	30,213,000

IDAHO	
Air Force: Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home	2,022,000

ILLINOIS	
Army:	
Granite City Engineer Depot	765,000
Savanna Ordnance Depot	758,000
Fort Sheridan	359,000
Navy:	
Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes	92,000
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	5,598,000
Air Force: Scott AFB, Belleville	900,000
Total	8,472,000

INDIANA	
Air Force: Bunker Hill AFB, Peru	8,966,000

IOWA	
Air Force: Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City	248,000

KANSAS	
Army:	
Fort Leavenworth	336,000
Fort Riley	2,525,000
Air Force:	
Forbes AFB, Topeka	1,357,000
McConnell AFB, Wichita	763,000
Schilling AFB, Salina	372,000
Total	5,353,000

KENTUCKY	
Army:	
Fort Campbell	5,117,000
Fort Knox	4,205,000
Total	9,322,000

LOUISIANA	
Army:	
Bossier Base	164,000
Fort Polk	7,734,000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia	3,653,000
Air Force:	
England AFB, Alexandria	1,558,000
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport	3,344,000
Lake Charles AFB, Lake Charles	179,000
Total	16,632,000

MAINE	
Navy:	
Naval Air Station, Brunswick	180,000
Naval Radio Station, Washington County	13,982,000
Air Force:	
Dow AFB, Bangor	14,638,000
Loring AFB, Limestone	7,322,000
Presque Isle AFB, Presque Isle	244,000
Total	36,366,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal
year 1958, continental United States—
Continued

MARYLAND

Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground.....	\$2,288,000
Fort Detrick.....	627,000
Fort George G. Meade.....	589,000
Fort Ritchie.....	820,000
Navy:	
Naval Academy, Annapolis.....	1,602,000
Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis.....	618,000
Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County.....	1,452,000
Naval Air Station, Patuxent River.....	2,209,000
Naval Air Facility (Andrews AFB) John H. Towers Field.....	3,200,000
Air Force: Andrews AFB, Camp Springs.....	920,000
Total.....	14,325,000

MASSACHUSETTS

Army:	
Boston defense area.....	58,000
Fort Devens.....	6,719,000
Air Force:	
Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford.....	3,469,000
Otis AFB, Falmouth.....	559,000
Westover AFB, Chicopee Falls.....	2,073,000
Total.....	12,878,000

MICHIGAN

Air Force:	
Kinross AFB, Sault Ste. Marie.....	1,118,000
K. I. Sawyer Municipal Air- port, Marquette.....	905,000
Selfridge AFB, Mount Clem- ens.....	2,898,000
Wurtsmith AFB, Oscoda.....	2,153,000
Total.....	7,074,000

MINNESOTA

Air Force: Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth.....	
	4,499,000

MISSISSIPPI

Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Sta- tion, Meridian.....	
	13,387,000
Air Force:	
Columbus AFB, Columbus.....	2,320,000
Greenville AFB, Greenville.....	19,389,000
Keesler AFB, Biloxi.....	2,209,000
Total.....	37,305,000

MISSOURI

Army: Fort Leonard Wood.....	
	4,663,000
Air Force:	
Aeronautical Chart and Infor- mation Center, St. Louis.....	60,000
Grandview AFB, Kansas City.....	1,100,000
Whiteman AFB, Knobnoster.....	235,000
Total.....	6,058,000

MONTANA

Air Force:	
Glasgow Site.....	3,232,000
Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls.....	3,518,000
Total.....	6,750,000

NEBRASKA

Army: Sioux Ordnance Depot.....	
	249,000
Air Force:	
Lincoln AFB, Lincoln.....	37,000
Offutt AFB, Omaha.....	7,681,000
Total.....	7,967,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal
year 1958, continental United States—
Continued

NEVADA

Army: Lake Mead Base.....	
	\$138,000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Sta- tion, Fallon.....	
	4,199,000
Air Force:	
Indian Spring Air Force Base.....	206,000
Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas.....	436,000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno.....	1,945,000
Total.....	6,924,000

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Army: Cold Regions Laboratory.....	
	2,496,000
Air Force: Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth.....	
	2,344,000
Total.....	4,840,000

NEW JERSEY

Army: Camp Kilmer.....	
	2,381,000
Air Force: McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown.....	
	595,000
Total.....	2,976,000

NEW MEXICO

Army:	
Manzano Base.....	50,000
White Sands Proving Ground.....	16,530,000
Air Force:	
Clovis AFB, Clovis.....	2,149,000
Holloman AFB, Alamogordo.....	11,869,000
Walker AFB, Roswell.....	9,676,000
Kirtland AFB, Albuquerque.....	2,276,000
Total.....	42,550,000

NEW YORK

Army:	
Bellemore, Long Island.....	1,201,000
Brooklyn Army Base.....	1,169,000
Fort Totten.....	200,000
United States Military Acad- emy.....	1,666,000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn.....	
	1,452,000
Air Force:	
Griffiss AFB, Rome.....	10,410,000
Mitchel AFB, Hempstead.....	963,000
Niagara Falls Municipal Air- port.....	674,000
Plattsburg AFB, Plattsburg.....	231,000
Stewart AFB, Newburgh.....	694,000
Suffolk County AFB, West- hampton.....	956,000
Total.....	19,616,000

NORTH CAROLINA

Army: Fort Bragg.....	
	1,051,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point.....	6,503,000
Naval Seaplane Facility, Har- vey Point.....	5,728,000
Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, Jacksonville.....	39,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Le- jeune.....	2,372,000
Air Force: Seymour Johnson AFB, Goldsboro.....	
	9,991,000
Total.....	25,684,000

NORTH DAKOTA

Air Force:	
Grand Forks AFB, Grand Forks.....	5,079,000
Minot AFB, Minot.....	6,889,000
Total.....	11,968,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal
year 1958, continental United States—
Continued

OHIO

Army: Cleveland Defense Area.....	
	\$350,000
Air Force:	
Lockbourne AFB, Columbus.....	1,504,000
Wright-Patterson AFB, Day- ton.....	1,777,000
Youngstown Municipal Air- port, Youngstown.....	217,000
Total.....	3,848,000

OKLAHOMA

Air Force:	
Altus AFB, Altus.....	848,000
Clinton-Sherman AFB, Clin- ton.....	536,000
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma City.....	2,674,000
Vance AFB, Enid.....	1,977,000
Total.....	6,035,000

OREGON

Air Force:	
Klamath Falls Municipal Air- port, Klamath.....	1,299,000
Portland International Air- port, Portland.....	3,768,000
Total.....	5,067,000

PENNSYLVANIA

Army: New Cumberland Gen- eral Depot.....	
	464,000
Navy:	
Naval Air Development Cen- ter, Johnsville.....	39,000
Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg.....	155,000
Aviation Supply Office, Phila- delphia.....	550,000
Air Force:	
Olmstead AFB, Middletown.....	1,673,000
Marietta AF Station.....	2,438,000
Total.....	5,319,000

RHODE ISLAND

Navy:	
Naval Station, Newport.....	2,729,000
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point.....	882,000
Total.....	3,611,000

SOUTH CAROLINA

Army:	
Charleston Transportation Corps Depot.....	306,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort.....	2,632,000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island.....	2,643,000
Air Force:	
Charleston AFB, Charleston.....	2,216,000
Donaldson AFB, Greenville.....	1,623,000
Myrtle Beach Municipal Air- port, Myrtle Beach.....	1,204,000
Shaw AFB, Sumter.....	1,184,000
Total.....	11,808,000

SOUTH DAKOTA

Air Force:	
Elsworth AFB, Rapid City.....	1,976,000
Rushmore AFS, Rapid City.....	56,000
Total.....	2,032,000

TENNESSEE

Army:	
Clarksville Base.....	200,000
Oak Ridge Defense Area.....	749,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal
year 1958, continental United States—
Continued

TENNESSEE

Air Force:
McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville----- \$189,000
Mallory AFB, Memphis----- 1,561,000
Sewart AFB, Smyrna----- 484,000
Total----- 3,183,000

TEXAS

Army:
Fort Bliss----- 7,704,000
Medina Base----- 125,000
Fort Hood----- 2,362,000
Killeen Base----- 379,000
Fort Worth General Depot----- 95,000
Fort Sam Houston----- 675,000

Navy:
Naval Auxiliary Air Station,
Chase Field----- 566,000
Naval Air Station, Corpus
Christi----- 140,000
Ordnance Aerophysics Labor-
atory, Daingerfield----- 2,649,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station,
Kingsville----- 160,000

Air Force:
Amarillo AFB, Amarillo----- 2,872,000
Bergstrom AFB, Austin----- 1,487,000
Biggs AFB, El Paso----- 5,557,000
Carswell AFB, Fort Worth----- 2,249,000
Dyess AFB, Abilene----- 100,000
Ellington AFB, Houston----- 8,000
Foster AFB, Victoria----- 683,000
Gray AFB, Killeen----- 34,000
Harlingen AFB, Harlingen----- 262,000
James Connally AFB, Waco----- 191,000
Kelly AFB, San Antonio----- 899,000
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio----- 250,000
Perrin AFB, Sherman----- 460,000
Randolph AFB, San Antonio----- 2,858,000
Reese AFB, Lubbock----- 5,909,000
Sheppard AFB, Wichita Falls----- 4,442,000
Webb AFB, Big Spring----- 4,118,000
Total----- 47,234,000

UTAH

Army: Dugway proving ground----- 54,000
Air Force: Hill AFB, Ogden----- 1,911,000
Total----- 1,965,000

VERMONT

Air Force: Ethan Allen AFB,
Winooski----- 723,000

VIRGINIA

Army:
Fort Belvoir----- 1,654,000
Fort Eustis----- 562,000
A. P. Hill Military Reservation----- 153,000
Fort Lee----- 5,417,000

Navy:
Naval Air Station, Chincoteague----- 2,818,000
Naval Air Station, Norfolk----- 39,000
Naval Communication Station,
Norfolk----- 443,000
Public Works Center, Norfolk----- 3,244,000
Naval Air Station, Oceana----- 6,975,000
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico----- 1,923,000

Air Force: Langley AFB, Hampton----- 20,000
Total----- 23,248,000

WASHINGTON

Army:
Camp Hanford----- 1,045,000
Fort Lewis----- 2,298,000
Seattle Market Center----- 40,000

Summary of military public works bill, fiscal
year 1958, continental United States—
Continued

WASHINGTON

Navy:
Naval Ammunition Depot,
Bangor----- \$316,000
Naval Shipyard, Bremerton----- 25,438,000
Naval Air Station, Whidbey
Island----- 9,365,000

Air Force:
Fairchild AFB, Spokane----- 1,480,000
Gelger Field, Spokane----- 1,583,000
Larson AFB, Moses Lake----- 12,552,000
McChord AFB, Tacoma----- 632,000
Total----- 54,749,000

WEST VIRGINIA

Navy: Naval Radio Facility,
Sugar Grove----- 6,600,000

WISCONSIN

Air Force:
Richard Bong AFB, Kansas-
ville----- 7,804,000
Truax Field, Madison----- 130,000
Total----- 7,934,000

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5807) to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "departments" insert "exclusive of part time or intermittent employees or native labor casually hired on an hourly or per diem basis."

Page 4, lines 13 and 14, strike out "after an investigation a finding is made that."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "an active" and insert "a."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "imprisonment." and insert "imprisonment."

"(c) No part of any amount paid on any claim filed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section in excess of 10 percent of the first \$1,000 so paid on such claim, and 7 percent of the amount so paid over \$1,000, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what is in this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that this is what is known as the Permanent Missing Persons Act. Previously we temporarily extended the Missing Persons Act. This bill was approved by the House and contained a provision for missing persons in the future and also a provision for the Philippine scouts. This bill went to the Senate and the Senate has made some minor changes. Perhaps the most important change is the one which they made adding subsection (c) to the bill. Subsection (c) limits the fees of attorneys that may handle cases to 10 percent up to \$1,000 and above \$1,000 the fee is limited to 7 percent. That is the most important amendment, perhaps, in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his explanation of the bill. I reserved the right to object because I feel in these closing days of the Congress the Members of this House should at least be advised as to what amendments they are accepting or what conference reports are agreed to before they are called upon to vote. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is always diligent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STADIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1937) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman is going to explain the changes made in this bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1957.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate discussed these three amendments at length. We came to the conclusion that this bill, if enacted, would give the Housing and

Public Law 85-241
85th Congress, H. R. 8240
August 30, 1957

AN ACT

To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Military installations.
Construction of public works.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

Army.

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Troop housing, \$2,288,000.
Anniston Ordnance Depot, Alabama: Utilities, \$2,015,000.
Jet propulsion laboratory, California: Utilities, \$130,000.
Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, and utilities, \$758,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebraska: Maintenance facility, \$249,000.
White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$16,530,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facility, land acquisition, and utilities, \$595,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$464,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Operational facility, storage facilities, hospital facility, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,417,000. 71 Stat. 531.

Seattle Quartermaster Market Center, Washington: Land acquisition, \$40,000. 71 Stat. 532.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$110,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facility, and land acquisition, \$95,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Utilities, \$627,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, \$54,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Troop housing, \$1,936,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Cold regions laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire: Research and development facility, \$2,496,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational facilities, training facility, and maintenance facility, \$1,654,000.

Granite City Engineer Depot, Illinois: Utilities, \$765,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, New York: Operational facilities, \$1,169,000.
Charleston TC Depot, South Carolina: Operational facilities, \$306,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$562,000.

(Medical Corps)

Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado: Troop housing, \$937,000.

Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Utilities, \$1,920,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$6,719,000.

(Second Army Area)

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Troop housing, \$153,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, \$4,205,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Community facilities, \$589,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, \$820,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,583,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and maintenance facilities, \$1,051,000.

71 Stat. 532.

71 Stat. 533.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, ground improvements, and utilities, \$5,117,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$7,549,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, \$3,691,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, medical facility, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$7,704,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational facilities, training facilities, administrative facility, maintenance facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$2,362,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$7,734,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Acquisition of land and improvements, \$675,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Utilities, \$1,049,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, \$336,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and troop housing, \$2,525,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, \$4,663,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facility, and utilities, \$1,487,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$3,307,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Utilities, \$1,666,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons)

Various installations: Operational facility, community facilities, and utilities, \$1,056,000.

(Tactical Installations Support Facilities)

Various locations: Operational facility, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, troop housing, family housing, and utilities, \$8,466,000.

(OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES)

(Alaskan Area)

Alaska general, Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greely, Ladd Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and tactical installations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, family housing, and utilities, \$4,143,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$154,000.

71 Stat. 533.

(Caribbean Command Area)

71 Stat. 534.

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$137,000.

Fort Gulick, Canal Zone: Community facility, \$289,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, \$20,754,000.

(Army Forces Far East)

Various installations: Operational facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, troop housing, community facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$9,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in a total amount of \$143,002,000.

Classified installations and facilities.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase out of appropriations available for military construction family housing

Family housing.

including necessary land at, or near, military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents. Not more than 300 units of such housing may be purchased under this section. Space limitations per unit will be in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 4774 of title 10, United States Code, and cost limitations as now or hereafter established for military housing constructed with appropriated funds.

70A Stat. 269.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

67 Stat. 440.

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)" with respect to Red River Arsenal, Texas, strike out "\$1,808,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,212,000".

67 Stat. 451.

(b) Public Law 209, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$44,003,000" and "\$133,671,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$44,407,000" and "\$134,075,000", respectively.

70 Stat. 991.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$2,360,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,137,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Military Academy)" with respect to United States Military Academy, New York, strike out "\$9,950,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,983,000".

68 Stat. 561.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$129,096,000" and "\$236,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$131,906,000" and "\$238,870,000", respectively.

69 Stat. 324.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

71 Stat. 534.

71 Stat. 535.

(1) with respect to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, strike out "\$1,736,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,039,000".

(2) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$212,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "\$8,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,874,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Camp Detrick, Maryland, strike out "\$452,000" and insert in place thereof "\$525,000".

(2) with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "\$1,129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,491,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Transportation Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooklyn Army Base, New York, strike out "\$1,055,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,240,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Eustis, Virginia, strike out "\$6,597,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,072,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES (Medical Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas, strike out "\$549,000" and insert in place thereof "\$876,000".

(2) with respect to Madigan Army Hospital, Washington, strike out "\$333,000" and insert in place thereof "\$669,000".

(3) with respect to Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia, strike out "\$3,557,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,472,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Second Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Holabird, Maryland, strike out "\$612,000" and insert in place thereof "\$800,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)"—with respect to Camp Jackson, South Carolina, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,500,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)"—with respect to Fort Hood, Texas, strike out "\$12,922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,283,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)"—

(1) with respect to Fort Carson, Colorado, strike out "\$7,487,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,621,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out "\$8,615,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,893,000".

(3) with respect to Camp Lucas, Michigan, strike out "\$145,000", and insert in place thereof "\$193,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)"—with respect to various installations, strike out "\$3,014,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,204,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

69 Stat. 328.

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AREA"—with respect to Wildwood Station (Kenai) strike out "\$469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$559,000".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "\$225,277,000", "\$74,984,000", and "\$534,254,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$237,320,000", "\$75,074,000", and "\$546,387,000", respectively.

69 Stat. 350;
70 Stat. 994.

71 Stat. 535.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

71 Stat. 536.

70 Stat. 991.

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in place thereof "\$136,000".

(2) with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "\$6,159,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,593,000".

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Quartermaster Corps)"—

(1) with respect to Atlanta General Depot, strike out "\$832,000" and insert in place thereof "\$984,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Worth General Depot, Texas, strike out "\$1,285,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,847,000".

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES"—

(1) with respect to Fort Bliss, Texas, strike out "\$5,301,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,293,000".

(2) with respect to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, strike out "\$4,173,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,798,000".

(3) with respect to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, strike out "\$1,092,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,373,000".

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102, "\$200,783,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$203,331,000".

70 Stat. 994.

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "\$86,916,000", "\$200,783,000", and "\$323,462,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,010,000", "\$203,331,000", and "\$334,104,000", respectively.

TITLE II

Navy.

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing, permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Development and test facilities, \$618,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Drydock, \$25,438,000.

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$1,452,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Facilities for remedying effects of ground subsidies, \$1,500,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Waterfront facilities, \$2,966,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, \$1,326,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Waterfront facilities, \$544,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, and utilities, \$2,729,000.

71 Stat. 536.

71 Stat. 537.

AVIATION FACILITIES

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, \$566,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$140,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Utilities, \$293,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$160,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$13,387,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$3,653,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and land acquisition, \$6,225,000.

Navy Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval Air Stations, Alameda, California: Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$185,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$180,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,089,000.

Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,818,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing, California: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,310,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$4,199,000.

Naval Seaplane Facility, Harvey Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$5,728,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities (Optical landing system), \$130,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, \$27,535,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, \$384,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, \$3,401,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$7,964,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$6,975,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$882,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, California: Operational facilities, waterfront facilities, and utilities, \$9,448,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$9,365,000.

71 Stat. 537.

71 Stat. 538.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,632,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,503,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, \$3,620,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Mojave, California: Land acquisition, \$3,281,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

(Special Purpose Air Stations)

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, \$39,000.

Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$2,209,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities (including operational facilities on San Nicolas Island), \$7,669,000.

Naval Air Facility, to be known as John H. Towers Naval Air Facility, and to be located at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, \$3,200,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Illinois: Administrative facilities, \$92,000.

Naval Ordnance Supply Office, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$155,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, \$550,000.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Community facilities, \$140,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$6,841,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, \$2,372,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, troop housing, messhall, and utilities, \$2,643,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,469,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$1,923,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Marine Corps Training Center, Twentynine Palms, California: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,331,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Washington: Utilities, \$316,000.

Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas: Research and development facilities, \$2,649,000.

Applied Physics Laboratory, Howard County, Maryland: Research and development facilities, \$1,452,000.

Naval Magazine, Port Chicago, California: Utilities, \$236,000.

SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Dormitory foundations, \$1,602,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$5,598,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$1,613,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$443,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, \$100,000.

Naval Communication Center, Stockton, California: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

Naval Radio Station, Washington County, Maine: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$13,982,000.

71 Stat. 538.

71 Stat. 539.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, New York: Utilities, \$332,000.
 Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$3,244,000.
 Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California:
 Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$759,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SHIPYARD FACILITIES

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$1,297,000.
 Naval Base, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,750,000.
 Naval Station, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Troop housing and community facilities, supply facilities, and ground improvements, \$7,576,000.

FLEET BASE FACILITIES

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Hospital facilities, community facilities, and family housing, \$1,005,000.
 Commander-in-Chief Pacific, Headquarters, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$332,000.
 Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Utilities, \$190,000.

71 Stat. 539.

71 Stat. 540.

AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Marianas Islands: Operational facilities (Guided missile support facilities), \$428,000.
 Naval Station, Argentia, Canada: Family housing and community facilities, \$1,793,000.
 Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities (Aircraft parking areas), \$2,088,000.
 Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, \$149,000.
 Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational facilities, \$5,730,000.
 Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$249,000.
 Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.
 Naval Station, Midway Islands, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities (Tactical air navigation facility), \$69,000.
 Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Waterfront facilities at White Beach, \$504,000.
 Naval Air Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, \$15,182,000.

SUPPLY FACILITIES

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Supply facilities, \$1,550,000.
 Naval Station, Guam, Marianas Islands: Community facilities, \$884,000.
 Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Supply facilities, \$397,000.

ORDNANCE FACILITIES

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Utilities, and land acquisition, \$326,000.

COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

Naval Communication Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, \$1,053,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Marianas Islands: Troop housing, \$594,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Istanbul, Turkey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$130,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sakata, Japan: Operational facilities, \$69,000.

Naval Radio Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$4,392,000.

YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES

Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Luzon, Philippine Islands: Maintenance facilities, \$393,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public work including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$59,056,000.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

66 Stat. 612.

71 Stat. 540.

71 Stat. 541.

Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES", with respect to "Various locations", strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,460,000".

66 Stat. 613.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$86,397,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$95,489,000".

66 Stat. 625.

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$138,183,000", "\$86,397,000", and "\$256,875,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof, "\$139,143,000", "\$95,489,000", and "\$266,927,000".

68 Stat. 540.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, El Centro, California, strike out "\$225,000" and insert in place thereof "\$369,000"; with respect to the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, strike out "\$1,675,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,030,000"; and with respect to the Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, strike out "\$70,000" and insert in place thereof "\$170,000".

68 Stat. 543.

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out, in section 202, "\$63,358,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$70,656,000".

70 Stat. 1001.

(c) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$102,956,000", "\$63,358,000", "\$202,807,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$103,555,000", "\$70,656,000", and "\$210,704,000".

69 Stat. 330.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, California, strike out "\$629,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,099,000".

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Station, Orange, Texas, strike out "\$399,000" and insert in place thereof "\$563,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Naval Air Training Stations)", with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, strike out "\$3,686,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,292,000"; and with respect to the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, New Iberia, Louisiana, strike out "\$24,361,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,871,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, strike out "\$3,729,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,217,000"; with respect to the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, strike out "\$2,581,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,355,000"; and with respect to the Outlying Field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Florida, strike out "\$1,087,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,587,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, strike out "\$16,311,000" and insert in place thereof "\$17,911,000".

(6) Under the subheading "ORDNANCE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Texas, strike out "\$1,111,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,751,000"; and with respect to the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, California, strike out "\$375,000" and insert in place thereof "\$475,000".

(7) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Maryland, strike out "\$780,000" and insert in place thereof "\$879,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, strike out "\$4,411,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,235,000".

(2) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, strike out "\$2,848,600" and insert in place thereof "\$3,198,600".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202 "\$151,342,400" and inserting in place thereof "\$152,763,400".

(d) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "\$299,512,600", "\$107,191,300", "\$151,342,400", and "\$564,046,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$308,463,600", "\$108,365,300", "\$152,763,400", and "\$575,592,300".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading, "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, strike out "\$148,000" and insert in place thereof "\$191,000"; and with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, strike out "\$5,984,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,169,000".

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Station, Long Beach, California, strike out "\$2,256,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,623,000"; and with respect to the Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$2,844,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,340,000".

71 Stat. 541.

71 Stat. 542.

69 Stat. 335.

69 Stat. 336.

69 Stat. 336.

70 Stat. 1002.

70 Stat. 994.

(3) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Fleet Support Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$8,835,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,040,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, strike out "\$1,682,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,010,000".

(5) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, strike out "\$7,469,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,919,000".

(6) Under the subheading "COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Communication Station, San Francisco, California, strike out "\$2,029,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,779,000".

(7) Under the subheading "YARDS AND DOCKS FACILITIES", with respect to the Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$443,000" and insert in place thereof "\$500,000".

70 Stat. 999.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan, strike out "\$1,961,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,337,000".

71 Stat. 542.

71 Stat. 543.

70 Stat. 1000.

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in section 203, "\$84,043,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$85,939,000".

70 Stat. 1015.

(d) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 402 the amounts "\$292,572,000", "\$61,625,000", "\$84,043,000", and "\$438,240,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$303,453,000", "\$62,001,000", "\$85,939,000", and "\$451,393,000".

TITLE III

Air Force.

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,499,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vermont: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$594,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,583,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,048,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,466,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,100,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$614,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Family housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$429,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$905,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,299,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$632,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tennessee: Supply facilities and community facilities, \$189,000.

71 Stat. 543.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$6,804,000.

71 Stat. 544.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$674,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Family housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$559,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,828,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,768,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Community facilities, \$244,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wisconsin: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,804,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,898,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$248,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvement, \$694,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$956,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$130,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,186,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,153,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$358,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$44,428,000.

AIR MATERIAL COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$10,410,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,911,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$899,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Utilities and ground improvements, \$2,438,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$4,912,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,673,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$13,104,000.

Rushmore Air Force Station, Rapid City, South Dakota: Community facilities, \$56,000.

Tinker Air Force Base: Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,674,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,777,000.

AIR PROVING GROUND COMMAND

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research development and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$5,826,000.

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,987,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$11,869,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nevada: Community facilities, \$206,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,276,000.

71 Stat. 544.

71 Stat. 545.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$3,469,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$2,882,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,872,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,193,000.

71 Stat. 545.

Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas: Community facilities, \$262,000.

71 Stat. 546.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,209,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$1,848,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, \$8,249,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$763,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$938,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Community facilities, \$436,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, \$460,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,858,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$5,909,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$900,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and real estate improvements, \$4,200,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,945,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,977,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, and ground improvements, \$4,118,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$865,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Land acquisition, \$50,000.

CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Medical facilities, \$952,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, \$139,000.

Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York: Utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$337,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Aeronautical chart and information center, St. Louis, Missouri: Utilities and ground improvements, \$620,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, \$920,000.

71 Stat. 546.

71 Stat. 547.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,216,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$745,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$496,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$848,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$3,344,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,458,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,487,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$5,557,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$11,510,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,966,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,059,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$2,076,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$536,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,320,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$2,361,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$14,638,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Community facilities, \$100,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, \$1,976,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational and training facilities, \$1,480,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational and training facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,357,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen Texas: Community facilities, \$34,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$19,389,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, \$380,000. 71 Stat. 547.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Georgia: Troop housing and community facilities, \$994,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, Louisiana: Real estate improvements, \$179,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$12,552,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, \$250,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Land acquisition, \$37,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,504,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,322,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$936,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,518,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,347,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,022,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,681,000.

Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, New York: Supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$231,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Supply facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,344,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Community facilities, \$372,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,937,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia : Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, \$8,628,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico : Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$9,676,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts : Operational and training facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,901,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri : Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$235,000.

71 Stat. 548.

71 Stat. 549.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico : Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$2,149,000.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, South Carolina : Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$1,287,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana : Troop housing, community facilities, and land acquisition, \$1,558,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Texas : Community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$683,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California : Supply facilities, and community facilities, \$2,478,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia : Utilities and ground improvements, \$20,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina : Maintenance facilities, troop housing, community facilities, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$1,204,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee : Community facilities, \$484,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina : Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and real estate improvements, \$9,991,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina : Troop housing, and community facilities, \$1,184,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations : Operational and training facilities, \$229,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations : Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, family housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, \$7,331,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Elmendorf Air Force Base : Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$4,742,000.

Ladd Air Force Base : Community facilities, \$1,630,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$11,500,000.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$247,000.

71 Stat. 549.

FAR EAST AIR FORCES

71 Stat. 550.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and community facilities, \$2,228,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$7,569,000.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$14,741,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Community facilities, \$820,000.

Ramsey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, \$3,783,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$57,218,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate improvements, \$36,057,000.

SPECIAL FACILITIES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, \$170,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, hospital and medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$20,000,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$47,000,000.

Classified
installations.

SEC. 303. (a) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—with respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, California, strike out "\$224,000" and insert in place thereof "\$584,000".

67 Stat. 349.

68 Stat. 544.

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Clinton-Sherman Airport, Clinton, Oklahoma, strike out "\$11,393,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,686,000"; and strike out "\$1,463,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,756,000".

68 Stat. 557.

Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, New York, strike out "\$729,000" and insert in place thereof "\$929,000"; and strike out "\$686,000" and insert in place thereof "\$886,000".

71 Stat. 550.

71 Stat. 551.

68 Stat. 557.

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out "\$27,478,000" and insert in place thereof "\$29,442,000"; and strike out "\$16,192,000" and insert in place thereof "\$18,156,000".

(b) Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 so much as reads "\$406,120,000" and "\$415,949,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$409,937,000" and "\$419,766,000", respectively.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

69 Stat. 337.

(1) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington, strike out "\$1,716,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,717,000";

70 Stat. 1013.

(2) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Dakota, strike out "\$7,709,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,220,000";

69 Stat. 337.

(3) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,029,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,195,000";

70 Stat. 1013.

(4) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out "\$6,603,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,268,000";

69 Stat. 338.

(5) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, California, strike out "\$2,445,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,935,000";

(6) with respect to Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, strike out "\$5,526,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,445,000";

(7) with respect to Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio, strike out "\$742,000" and insert in place thereof "\$893,000";

(8) with respect to Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Arizona, strike out "\$2,107,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,676,000".

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama, strike out "\$4,170,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,728,000";

(2) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out "\$15,803,000" and insert in place thereof "\$16,654,000";

(3) with respect to McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out "\$9,522,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,970,000";

(4) with respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, strike out "\$12,001,000" and insert in place thereof "\$14,508,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

70 Stat. 1013.

(1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas, strike out "\$3,438,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,876,000";

69 Stat. 340.

(2) with respect to Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, strike out "\$4,081,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,088,000";

(3) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Mississippi, strike out "\$500,000" and insert in place thereof "\$545,000"; 70 Stat. 1013.

(4) with respect to Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Texas, strike out "\$446,000" and insert in place thereof "\$529,000"; 69 Stat. 340.

(5) with respect to James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas, strike out "\$883,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,129,000";

71 Stat. 551.

(6) with respect to Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, strike out "\$1,516,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,998,000"; 71 Stat. 552.

(7) with respect to Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, strike out "\$1,076,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,304,000";

(8) with respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, strike out "\$1,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,556,000". 70 Stat. 1013.

Under the subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND"—with respect to Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, strike out "\$520,000" and insert in place thereof "\$825,000". 69 Stat. 341.

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—with respect to Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary Numbered 1), Clark, Nevada, strike out "\$555,500" and insert in place thereof "\$624,500". 69 Stat. 342.

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, strike out "\$5,929,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,363,000"; 69 Stat. 343.

(2) with respect to Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine, strike out "\$11,155,000" and insert in place thereof "\$12,218,000";

(3) with respect to Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California, strike out "\$9,769,000" and insert in place thereof "\$11,473,000";

(4) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$6,657,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,324,000".

Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, strike out "\$2,684,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,527,000"; 69 Stat. 345.

(2) with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, strike out "\$559,000" and insert in place thereof "\$611,000";

(3) with respect to George Air Force Base, Victorville, California, strike out "\$1,598,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,905,000";

(4) with respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington, strike out "\$4,724,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,197,000"; 70 Stat. 1014.

(5) with respect to Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee, strike out "\$3,589,000" and insert in place thereof "\$4,010,000". 69 Stat. 346.

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Galena Airfield, strike out "\$518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000". 69 Stat. 346.

Under the subheading "AREA CONTROL NAVIGATIONAL AIDS"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$526,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,394,000".

(c) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts 70 Stat. 1014.

"\$801,256,000", "\$532,454,000", and "\$1,339,060,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$824,300,000", "\$533,539,000", and "\$1,363,189,000", respectively.

71 Stat. 552.

71 Stat. 553.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

70 Stat. 1002.

Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota, strike out "\$863,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,469,000";

(2) with respect to Geiger Field, Spokane, Washington, strike out "\$2,827,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,079,000";

(3) with respect to Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana, strike out "\$2,470,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,080,000";

(4) with respect to Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota, strike out "\$18,969,000" and insert in place thereof "\$30,521,000";

(5) with respect to Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri, strike out "\$1,673,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,781,000";

(6) with respect to Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, strike out "\$2,156,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,336,000";

(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oregon, strike out "\$1,130,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,560,000";

(8) with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "\$21,215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$27,035,000";

(9) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York, strike out "\$3,030,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,409,000";

(10) with respect to Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California, strike out "\$2,392,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,779,000";

(11) with respect to Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa, strike out "\$2,288,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,900,000";

(12) with respect to Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin, strike out "\$4,876,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,726,000";

(13) with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "\$3,278,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,808,000";

(14) with respect to various locations, strike out "\$21,510,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,201,000".

70 Stat. 1004.

Under the subheading "AIR MATERIEL COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York, strike out "\$17,966,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,005,000";

(2) with respect to Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine, strike out "\$473,000" and insert in place thereof "\$745,000";

(3) with respect to Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "\$129,000" and insert in place thereof "\$251,000";

(4) with respect to Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, strike out "\$5,990,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,763,000".

Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND"—

70 Stat. 1005.

(1) with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, strike out "\$17,121,000" and insert in place thereof "\$26,471,000";

(2) with respect to Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama, strike out "\$18,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,000";

(3) with respect to Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, strike out "\$24,433,000" and insert in place thereof "\$33,858,000";

71 Stat. 553.

(4) with respect to Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nevada, strike out "\$2,221,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,063,000";

71 Stat. 554.

(5) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "\$977,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,064,000".

Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY"—with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out "\$215,000" and insert in place thereof "\$311,000".

70 Stat. 1006.

Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL AIR COMMAND"—

(1) with respect to Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California, strike out "\$13,395,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,993,000";

(2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Georgia, strike out "\$345,000" and insert in place thereof "\$500,000".

Under the subheading "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND"—

70 Stat. 1007.

(1) with respect to Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts, strike out "\$6,939,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,530,000";

(2) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, strike out "\$5,488,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,220,000".

Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND"—

71 Stat. 1008.

(1) with respect to Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Texas, strike out "\$922,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,190,000";

(2) with respect to Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California, strike out "\$2,179,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,643,000";

(3) with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "\$14,518,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,322,000";

(4) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, strike out "\$943,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,075,000";

(5) with respect to Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida, strike out "\$1,694,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,966,000";

(6) with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "\$4,952,000" and insert in place thereof "\$7,880,000";

(7) with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$1,236,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,586,000";

(8) with respect to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, strike out "\$2,064,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,607,000";

(9) with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "\$5,697,000" and insert in place thereof "\$6,155,000";

(10) with respect to Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, New York, strike out "\$1,491,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,027,000";

(11) with respect to Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, strike out "\$661,000" and insert in place thereof "\$720,000";

(12) with respect to Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, strike out "\$2,791,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,181,000".

70 Stat. 1010.

Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND"—with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "\$2,613,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,785,000".

71 Stat. 554.

71 Stat. 555.

(b) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" as follows:

70 Stat. 1011.

Under the subheading "NORTHEAST AIR COMMAND"—with respect to various locations, strike out "\$75,650,000" and insert in place thereof "\$94,197,000".

70 Stat. 1015.

(c) Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts "\$742,873,000", "\$405,061,000", and "\$1,360,934,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$811,342,000", "\$423,608,000", and "\$1,447,950,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1012), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this subsection, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto."

Notification to
Congressional
Committees.

TITLE IV—FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 401. Any outstanding authority heretofore provided by the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991) for the provision of family housing shall be available for the construction of family housing at any installations for which family housing is authorized to be constructed under titles I, II, and III of this Act.

SEC. 402. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

Leases.

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed \$150 a month for any such unit."

Net floor area
limitations.

SEC. 403. (a) Family quarters to be constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119),

shall be subject to the net floor area limitations respectively prescribed in sections 4774, 7574, and 9774 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) Section 404 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), is hereby repealed.

70A Stat. 269, 468,
590.
Repeal.

SEC. 404. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 4774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

70A Stat. 269.

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Army may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

71 Stat. 555.

71 Stat. 556.

(b) Section 7574 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

70A Stat. 468.

“(d) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Navy may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

(c) Section 9774 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

70A Stat. 590.

“(f) Not more than 15 percent of the family quarters constructed from appropriated funds for enlisted members of the Air Force may be four-bedroom quarters having a net floor area of 1,250 square feet or less.”

SEC. 405. The second paragraph of section 407 of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119, 1125), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

“The Department of Defense shall pay the Commodity Credit Corporation, from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel and from appropriate allotments or rental charges for civilian personnel, amounts equal to the quarters allowances or allotments otherwise payable to or the rental charges collected from personnel occupying any housing constructed or acquired under authority of this section after deducting amounts chargeable for the maintenance and operation of such housing: *Provided*, That such payments shall not exceed the dollar equivalent of the value of the foreign currencies used for all such construction or acquisition.”

Commodity Credit
Corporation.
Payment.

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, and effective July 1, 1958, no family housing units (other than housing units required to be acquired pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall be contracted for or acquired at or in support of military installations or activities unless the actual number of units involved has been specifically authorized by an annual military construction authorization act.

Limitation.

Restriction.

69 Stat. 652.

42 USC 1594a.

(b) Effective July 1, 1958, the provisions of section 419, Public Law 968, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, are hereby repealed.

Repeal.

70 Stat. 1018.

SEC. 407. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate quarters under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services, notwithstanding that such quarters may have been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters. The net difference between the basic allowance for quarters and the fair rental value of such quarters shall be paid from otherwise available appropriations.

Occupancy.

(b) The provisions of this section shall be administered under regulations approved by the President.

Administration.

(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary of the Treasury for

Rental housing
designation.

the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Secretary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the "Secretaries"), are each authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to (b) above, to designate as rental housing such housing as he may determine to be inadequate as public quarters.

71 Stat. 556.

71 Stat. 557.

(d) The Secretaries are each further authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to subsection (b) above, to lease inadequate housing to personnel of any of the mentioned services for occupancy by them and their dependents. The housing facilities leased, as herein provided, shall not be required to have been constructed with funds derived from appropriations specifically made for the purpose of the construction of rental housing for personnel of the services mentioned.

(e) All housing units determined pursuant to subsection (c) of this section to be inadequate shall, prior to July 1, 1960, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of.

Nonapplicability. (f) This section shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of Title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

63 Stat. 570.

12 USC 1748 et

seq.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Land improve-
ments, etc.

31 USC 529;

40 USC 259, 267.

70A Stat. 269,

590.

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

33 USC 733 note.

Appropriation.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations, for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$115,624,000; outside the United States, \$34,477,000; section 102, \$143,002,000; or a total of \$293,103,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$230,356,000; outside the United States, \$48,199,000; section 202, \$59,056,000; or a total of \$337,611,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$394,076,000; outside the United States, \$160,705,000; section 302, \$47,000,000; or a total of \$601,781,000.

Cost variations. SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 504. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

Contracts.

70A Stat. 132.

71 Stat. 557.

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts;

71 Stat. 558.

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 505. Contracts made by the United States under this Act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

70A Stat. 127.

41 USC 152.

Report to Congress.

SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1958, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before July 28, 1954, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

Repeals.

Exceptions.

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts in whole or in part before July 1, 1958, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of \$100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

68 Stat. 559.

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in sections 2231–2238 of title 10, United States Code, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882, 883, 885, 886);

70A Stat. 120–123.

64 Stat. 830, 831.

(5) the authorization for the development of the Line of Communications, France, in the amount of \$60,000,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress;

68 Stat. 537.

(6) notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), the authorization for (a) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,439,000 that is contained in title I, section 102, of the Act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 336, 343), and (b) development of classified facilities in the amount of \$6,654,000 that is contained in title I, section 102 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 609); and

(7) the authorization for public works and for the appropriations of funds that are contained in the Act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47), as amended.

Cost limitation. SEC. 507. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project within the continental United States at an average nationwide unit cost in excess of—

- (a) \$28 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;
- (b) \$6 per square foot for regular warehousing;
- (c) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;
- (d) \$7,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters,

71 Stat. 558.

71 Stat. 559.

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitation on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

Air Force
Academy.

SEC. 508. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "\$126,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$135,425,000".

Approved August 30, 1957.

